

MAN AND CHRIST

BY

CLAYTON REID

239 R353M

DUKE
UNIVERSITY



WOMAN'S COLLEGE
LIBRARY



Man and Christ

Man and Christ

Man and Christ

ALBERT CLAYTON REID

Professor of Philosophy
Wake Forest College

with a foreword by


FRANK S. HICKMAN

Professor Emeritus of the Psychology of Religion
Duke University

1954

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

DURHAM, N. C.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
Duke University Libraries

<https://archive.org/details/manchrist01reid>

FOREWORD

YEARS AGO A KEEN STUDENT of philosophy in Boston University went over to the neighboring campus of Harvard University to attend a convention of American philosophers then in session. She listened to a number of addresses, then some while afterward told me her impressions of them. One of these was that there was a singular aversion to any real recognition of God in the world-views which the philosophers set forth. But there was one notable exception in the address of Dr. Rufus Jones, the distinguished Quaker thinker, who set God squarely in the middle of his theory. If such a convention were held today and Wake Forest College had sent its representative to it, there would certainly be at least two such philosophers (provided Dr. Jones were still here to bless the world with his great spirit): Rufus Jones and Dr. Albert Clayton Reid, whose influence has spread widely through the South. Dr. Reid has as staunchly theocentric a philosophy as Rufus Jones himself.

The present volume by Dr. Reid, *Man and Christ*,

Foreword

is a record of a series of lectures delivered at Duke University before the Phillips Brooks Club, an interdenominational group of ministers which for many years has assembled monthly throughout the school year to hear discussions of problems of special interest to the clergy. Dr. Reid's fine modesty was clearly apparent in his diffidence as a layman in presenting to ministers problems relating to the meaning of Christ in our complex modern world. But his success was evidenced by the enthusiastic demand of his hearers that the lectures be reproduced in book form. With this demand he reluctantly complied. My own judgment is that this small volume should have a wide acceptance among the Protestant clergy of America. And I see no reason why a devout Catholic could not read it with profit as well.

Let me bear testimony that this is as brilliant a piece of writing in the religious field as I have encountered in many a day. Frequent sentences, figures of speech, and crisp utterances would do high credit to the style of Ralph Waldo Emerson. Dr. Reid's argument is never labored, but sweeps the reader with a feeling that he has been lifted to a great eminence and had a wonderful panorama spread before him. Indeed, Dr. Reid is an accomplished master of what I was once taught to call the panoramic style of speaking and writing. To be sure, this is no book for an indolent reader. A person who would get its inner meaning and sound its real depth must be constantly on the alert to seize its flashing sentences. And he must have

Foreword

a considerable acquaintance with masters in the field of modern science and philosophy, to say nothing of the older masters as well, to match stride with Dr. Reid's rapid survey of the best thought of our time with reference to the relation of religion to science and our pressing world situation.

A word must be said about the forthright realism of this author. He is fully aware of the difficulties confronting the reverent man of faith in such a world as ours. He does not dodge these difficulties, but resolutely sets himself to sound them to their very depths. His frank appraisal of the points made by skeptics with regard to the claims of religious faith will doubtless bring many a conventional mind up against thorny alternatives which he would rather avoid by resorting to an unquestioning dogmatism. But the author's realistic handling of the antireligious arguments will cause equal discomfiture among the unspiritually minded scientists and philosophers who fancy that what cannot be weighed, measured, and computed in quantitative terms has no reality. For Dr. Reid plunges beneath all the claims of the senses to that living level of reality which only the spiritual nature of man can apprehend and feel with certainty. The really thoughtful man of faith will find much to encourage him in the searching realism of this volume; and the really reverent man of science and philosophy will find much that is basic in any ultimate conception of reality which he can achieve.

FRANK S. HICKMAN
Duke University

CONTENTS

vii

Foreword, *by Frank S. Hickman*

3

Introduction

9

Man and Nature

26

Man and Knowledge

48

Man and Conflict

69

Man and Christ

86

References

INTRODUCTION

I HAVE RECEIVED TWO letters which reveal the seriousness of religious affairs. One of the letters came from a prominent business executive. He asked me these questions: "How can one know the reality of God? How can one know that a person is a unique spiritual being, that is, an immortal soul? How can a person know that God is interested in him, and has some plan for his life? If God has a plan for a person's life, how can he know God's will for him and so use his time and efforts that his life will conform as far as possible to the will of God for him?"

The other letter came from Korea. It was from a chaplain who wrote me from Heartbreak Ridge where he was surrounded by the heavy thunder of guns, vast wreckage, and mortal combat, carnage, agony, and death. The chaplain asked me if I had ever tried to tell a confused and baffled young man that life has real and enduring value. He also asked me this searching question: "What would you say to a dying soldier as you held his head upon your knees?"

Man and Christ

We meet the same type of exacting problems and responsibilities in various ways and places, and some of us know how serious they are and how helpless we feel when we face them. It is difficult, if not impossible, to point out another period within recent centuries when there existed as much confusion, tension, and hopelessness. We have been so enamored of the tangible and the temporal that we have lost faith in the enduring. Scientific, industrial, social, and educational developments have produced what many people feel is an illusion of progress, while wars and preparation for war have brought us to the brink of what a host of people fear is world catastrophe.

Moreover, in view of existing confusion, many of us—clergy and laymen—find ourselves pitifully unprepared to speak convincingly about spiritual reality. For example, what are we able to reply when an intelligent man, in complete earnestness and sincerity, asks us plain questions about such vital matters as the reality of God and of the human soul, the existence of moral law, the hope of personal immortality, the love and the goodness of God, the nature of sin and of salvation? When hungry souls cry out for bread, are they usually given stones?

I have said these things for a purpose. It is clear that religious leaders must recognize the nature of the present religious situation and their inescapable responsibility and high privilege. In this crucial time we must not underestimate the vital obligation of a Christian minister or, indeed, that of any Christian

Introduction

layman. You will agree with me, I feel sure, that one cardinal evil of our generation is the lukewarmness, the complacency, the superficiality, and the forms of pride now existing in the field of religion. You have, very likely, often felt that Christian convictions have become feeble, that Christian standards have become obscure, that smoke hides the sun, and that artificial illumination keeps us from seeing the stars. The plain fact is that our Christian organizations and programs do not reflect a faith that is convincing to the non-Christian world either at home or abroad.

Unless we develop a faith that is genuine and impelling, we cannot hope to dispel the present moral darkness and to remove the selfishness that flourishes in high places and in low places. Forms of arrogance are numerous and glaring. International conflagrations impoverish us in various ways. We are exhausting our material wealth and placing financial burdens upon generations unborn; we are bartering our political freedoms for opportunism and expediency; vastly worse, we are wasting our moral resources and giving future generations a heritage almost devoid of faith. We are squandering our moral birthright, and our spiritual reserves have become so limited that another crisis, military or financial, could bring a national collapse.

Now, a free people, resting upon the solid rock of faith in God, cannot be overcome by hardship or conquered by foreign enemies; but a spiritually weak civilization will collapse because of the vacuum within.

Man and Christ

The worst symptom of an existing moral vacuum is widespread apathy toward evils, for we appear to be insensitive to crime, undisturbed by intemperance, and hardly concerned about a war in progress. The role of Christian leadership becomes plain when we realize that awareness of God and wise and genuine devotion to him are essential to the development and preservation of human freedom and spiritual welfare. The Kingdom of God is here and now, and we must become wise and effective workers in the Kingdom.

The Christian faith is vital and basic to man's beliefs, motives, and freedom. A person's conviction about the reality of God, of the human soul, and of spiritual principles directs him in his devotions and practices. An awareness of enduring reality gives him a permanent standard of reference for all temporal things, hopes, values, and loyalties. It is a person's knowledge of God and his relation to God that enable him to maintain valid dignity and high courage, for he thus realizes and respects his divine lineage and heritage. In this way he understands that he is in the image of a spiritual, creative God, and that he himself is, therefore, spiritual and creative. He is aware that he lives in a moral universe in which ethical principles are real, in which honor, justice, temperance, and love are not human inventions but divine law, and in which he as God's representative has a divine responsibility. Such knowledge of the truth is indispensable to freedom, moral progress, and hope. Truth is imperishable, and the choice fruits of truth are free per-

Introduction

sons. More than that, the very rootage of truth runs deep in the divinely human nature of God's earthly children.

One can safely assume that a civilization never rises above the level of its concept of Deity. If the concept is crude or refined, vague or clear, the civilization will reflect the condition. A nation consists of persons. There are leaders, and there are followers. There are rural and urban groups. There are numerous types of institutions, including political, industrial, and educational. But persons and the convictions of persons shape and establish the moral standard of any organization, institution, or civilization. Furthermore, the soundness of concepts, the permanence of standards, the integrity of an institution, and the endurance of a civilization depend upon conformity to the truth. Great policies, constitutions, laws, homes, schools, churches, and all other implements of culture and freedom must be constructed upon the bedrock foundation of divine reality. No civilization can hope to be either safe or constructive very long, if it presumes to substitute any other foundation for that of a sound faith in God. God is not mocked; he will not abdicate in the interest of opinion or other types of human devices.

What is the cause of the present inadequate religious situation? No person can list all of the widely different forces that converge and produce existing conditions, and a layman dares not presume to do more than mention a few matters leading to our re-

Man and Christ

ligious situation. In the four papers which follow, I shall discuss four things—Man and Nature, Man and Knowledge, Man and Conflict, and Man and Christ—in an effort to stress the magnitude, the difficulty, and the importance of a Christian minister's work. Make no mistake about it, a religious leader stands on the stage of modern affairs, in the spotlight of science, before a background of history, and facing an audience waiting to hear words of truth and faith. Laymen know the theater of life—the building, the trappings, the actors, the plays. They want to know what the play means. Will the play end; the actors, like Caesar's family, all die; the lights go out; then come oblivion, "the timeless silence of the dreamless dust"? Or is the drama of human life a prelude to personal, glorious immortality? There is a grave need to distinguish between the seen and the unseen, between the temporal and the enduring, between reason and faith. Some things we shall consider are neither easy nor pleasant, but I assume that a Christian minister is earnest, sincere, and courageous, and that he, to the uttermost of his ability, desires to be a wise and convincing ambassador of Christ to a troubled and needy world.

MAN AND NATURE

WHAT IS MAN'S STATUS in the universe? What is his place in nature? Does he occupy a unique position in kind, in quality, and in duration? Or is he only a part of the vast realm of natural forces and objects, different in degree and not in kind? The problem is as old as human history.

Nature is here defined as the realm which embraces all modes of inanimate existence and all types of life. It includes all phenomena, physical objects, and organisms of the fields designated by the natural sciences. While the problem of man's place in the realm of nature is very old and has been approached in various ways, let us here, for convenience, use three developments that appeared during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. They are the new geography, the new astronomy, and the new anatomy. Of course, ancient scholars, including the Greeks, knew a great deal about physics and biology; and they offered valuable theories about the nature of the physical universe, the origin and development of organisms, and

Man and Christ

man's place in the world. But the developments, or revivals, in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries were in a real sense new. Certainly, each one of these three related movements caused revolutionary changes in basic philosophical and religious concepts.

The new geography revealed to the man of the fifteenth century a new earth and a new world. Prior to the discovery of America by Columbus, Europeans generally believed that the earth occupied the center of the universe and that it was flat and had corners and sides. They were convinced that the sky was a vaulted firmament resting upon the seas or upon pillars. They understood that the sun, moon, and stars were set in the firmament, that rain fell from open windows of heaven, and that heaven was above the firmament. People relied upon sense perception and proof-texts as convincing evidence of such beliefs, for they observed that rain, snow, and hail fell downward, while, of course, the sun passed overhead and gave light by day and the moon and stars furnished light by night.

Not only was the universe geocentric; it was also homocentric. Man was a unique creation, for he was made in the image of God, and placed in a garden. Everything else was, as it were, created for him, and he was commanded to have dominion.

The voyage of Columbus revealed a fact that wrecked mediaeval man's smug little concept of an earth-centered universe. His discovery that the earth is a sphere smashed prevailing erroneous beliefs about

Man and Nature

the earth. At the same time, he dealt a powerful blow to man's conceit and to numerous forms of religious dogma and authority. Moreover, the new earth challenged ambitious men to seek adventure, to discover new lands, and to acquire wealth. Continents must be explored; lands and seas must be charted; governments must be extended. Thus, the new earth offered tangible objectives and specific rewards, and it challenged men of intelligence, vision, and courage to explore it and transform it. Nothing else provoked such enthusiasm and effort; intangible truths, by contrast, seemed relatively unimportant, and the seed of discontent about religious dogmas was planted. That seed germinated, and, to many people, tangible materialistic-utilitarian achievements seemed more important than religious beliefs.

Interest was not restricted to geographical exploration. Thoughtful persons became concerned about the place of the new earth in the universe. Old heliocentric theories were remembered. Mathematics developed. Modern science was about to be born—a precocious child who, by experiment and logic, would dare explore every accessible area of the earth and of the heavens. With the birth of modern science, the new astronomy appeared.

The new astronomy is, therefore, a second revolutionary development. Despite the established spherical nature of the earth, the geocentric conception persisted. In the early part of the sixteenth century Copernicus formulated the heliocentric theory. He

Man and Christ

was familiar with the Ptolemaic theory; he had read Cicero's account of Hicetas' doctrine that the earth moved; and it is likely that he was acquainted with the doctrines of Heracleides and Aristarchus. Using the two-pointed instrument, mathematics and geometry, Copernicus fashioned the heliocentric concept. While the work of Tycho Brahe in charting the stars and the mathematical genius of Kepler must be noted here, Galileo was the intellectual giant who, through devotion to scientific methods and experimental achievements, deserves to be called the father of modern science. His experiment, at Pisa, with falling iron balls crushed the authority attributed to Aristotle. His telescope enabled him to observe craters on the moon, the moons of Jupiter, the phases of Venus, spots on the sun, and thousands of stars hitherto unseen. He proved the heliocentric theory and gave man a new universe. His observations led—through Newton, Herschel, and a host of others—to the discovery of billions of stars in almost infinite space.

The new astronomy overthrew the geocentric theory and forced man to reconsider himself in relation to time and space. The problem of readjustment of his conception of himself to astronomical space and time was so important, so comprehensive, and so difficult that it still perplexes us. A few facts about the stellar universe will refresh our memories in regard to the problem of a person's status in the universe.

Our galaxy, of which of course the sun is a member, resembles a watch or a grindstone in shape. It

Man and Nature

consists of at least two billion suns, many of which are much larger than ours. This swarm of stars is about 300,000 light years in diameter. Work it out yourself, in miles. Multiply the number of seconds in 300,000 years by the velocity of light per second, 186,300; you will find the distance about $1\frac{3}{4}$ quintillian miles. Then, too, the sun moves through space about 400 million miles a year, and our galaxy itself is going somewhere. Our galaxy has been coming from somewhere for millions of years; it will be going somewhere for millions of years.

But, of course, our galactic system is only one of an almost unlimited number of stellar systems. There are probably more than a million such systems. They are said to resemble swarms of bees—galactic swarms of about 100 million stars. But the swarms of stars are very far apart, relatively about as far from each other as if there were one swarm of bees in North America, another in South America, another in England, and another in Hawaii. According to Eddington, the stellar universe is, conservatively, about 200 million light years in diameter, which “leaves room for a few million spirals.”

The age of the universe staggers one who thinks of it. Nobody knows when stars were formed of the original cosmic substance, but astronomers write of young stars and old stars. A few illustrations are enough for our present purpose. Eddington suggests that our sun became “a luminous star” about five billion years ago, and that it will continue for at least

Man and Christ

fifty billion years. Other astronomers are conservative in their estimates, but a difference of a few billion years does not reduce the difficulty of our problem.

So, the age-old cry comes from our hearts: What am I in time and place? The naïve conception of the universe and of time is gone. The easy homocentric belief is gone. A man is a microscopic unit, clinging for a second to the surface of a small planet of one sun among billions of suns! In view of the astronomical vastness of time and space, what is a man? Can you answer the question, clearly and satisfactorily, for those people who rely upon you?

The third movement, the new human anatomy, developed almost contemporaneously with the discovery of a new world and a new universe. The body of information derived from comparative anatomy and human anatomy also led man to apply caustic inquiry to himself. It made man question his claim to uniqueness, even among organisms on the earth. Man had not only believed the earth the center of the universe, he felt that he was a special, superior creation, essentially different from all other creatures. He thus believed himself unique in his nature and from the point of view of divine concern.

Vesalius founded the first laboratory of human anatomy, in the University of Salerno. By 1642 he had published a superb work on human anatomy. Thus a powerful movement in biological science developed. Its impact upon contemporary philosophy and theology was tremendous, for human anatomy revealed that

Man and Nature

the human organism is similar to that of the brute. It showed that one finds in lower animals the counterpart of every major structure and function of the human body and revealed that the anatomy and physiology of man are, in the larger sense, similar to those of the brute. Perhaps, then, man is not unique, and the disturbing suspicion arises that a person belongs to the order of animals, differing from them only in secondary characteristics and not in kind.

Biological science gained in scope and in momentum. It came to include the vegetable kingdom and the animal kingdom. It explored the cell and the complex organism, and it read the massive, well-filled pages of geology. It discovered laws of heredity, patterns of development of types of organisms, vast periods of flora and fauna, and the approximate age of life on the earth. It is plain, therefore, that, in our efforts to establish the uniqueness of man, we cannot ignore such matters as biologic time, the origin of life, the appearance and relation of various types of plants and of animals, and man's resemblance to other types of life.

For example, geology reveals that life has existed on the earth about 1500 million years. The earliest forms of life were perhaps blue algae and green algae. Molluscs existed some 500 million years ago, and—to mention only these—fishes, reptiles, mammals, and anthropoids appeared later. Although the origin of life is unexplained, and although the cause of development into types of organisms is theoretical, the development

Man and Christ

of human organisms seems to have occurred within the last million years. Cro-Magnon man, a higher type of prehistoric man, is said to have appeared within the last 30,000 years.

In view of facts cited in historical biology, questions related to our most cherished concepts about ourselves inevitably arise. Did life originate in a chemical reaction? If so, is life basically chemical? Did the original unit of protoplasm, whatever the nature and cause of its origin, evolve progressively into more and more complex and advanced forms until, through all modes of variations, man was achieved? Do all organisms, then, have a common chemical, or protoplasmic, ancestor who lived about 1500 million years ago?

But, whatever the answer to such questions, man himself offers problems enough. The human family consists of various races, every degree of ability, and all levels of social and moral conditions. Even a little knowledge of anthropology makes one wonder whether man is unique or not. Then, too, have you ever stood on the seashore and watched the waves come in, one by one, and break upon the sand, and thought how they have rolled in and broken, one after the other, for millions of years? There are about two billion people on the earth. These two billion persons are only one generation of countless generations of the tide of humanity ending, wave after wave, on the breakers of death. Then, what is a person? Is he only a momentary, conscious, organic incident? Or, to use another figure, perhaps he is,

Man and Nature

Like snow upon the desert's dusty face,
Lighting a little hour or two—is gone.

The three movements—the new earth, the new universe, and the new biology—represent man's expanding knowledge of himself and of the realm of nature of which he seems to be a part. The impact of this knowledge upon religious concepts and devotions is tremendous and persistent.

ATTITUDE TOWARD PROBLEMS

We must not ignore the problems associated with man's relation to nature. We cannot destroy our ships, telescopes, microscopes, and wealth of information and revert to the naïve concepts of the Middle Ages. As informed Christians, thoughtful persons who represent Christ, we are doubly obligated to declare ourselves. Let me specify a few possible attitudes.

First, some persons have arbitrarily ignored or denied bodies of newly established facts. Some low or perverted minds have assumed that attitude in an effort to justify their beliefs and wishes or to protect vested interests. Others permit their zeal for defending religious concepts to exceed their wisdom, as was the case with the man who arose and said: "Mr. Chairman, I arise in defense of Almighty God." It is a dangerous situation when loyalty is not supported by wisdom, and when people resolve that the truth must be confined in formulas and tombs. Academic arrogance and religious dogmatism are alike barriers to progress.

Man and Christ

The spherical nature of the earth was, of course, known to the ancient Greeks. But the doctrine of Aristarchus and others was neglected or largely suppressed for fifteen centuries. Biblical statements about the ends of the earth, the firmament, waters above the firmament, and the function of the sun, the moon, and the stars were interpreted literally. Many prominent leaders used Scripture in proof of the flatness of the earth until Columbus and Magellan dealt them a crushing blow, and adventure and material profits administered an anaesthetic.

The new astronomy brought bitter and prolonged opposition. Copernicus was unsafe in Rome. He returned to Poland, and, because of the hostility of both Protestants and Catholics, he delayed publication of his book thirty years. Catholics condemned the book, while such Protestants as Luther, Melancthon, and Calvin denounced Copernican astronomy. Bruno, who believed that stars are scattered throughout infinite space, openly opposed orthodox religious beliefs; in 1600 the Inquisition had him burned at the stake. When Galileo reported the moons of Jupiter, the phases of Venus, craters on the moon, and spots on the sun, a storm of fury broke upon him. Some religious and academic leaders were merciless. Galileo was called a heretic and an atheist. Some of his enemies refused to look through the telescope. Others said his announcements were unscriptural, scandalous, and contrary to the Christian plan of salvation. Old, feeble, partially blind, and ill, Galileo was brought

Man and Nature

before the Inquisition and forced to recant. When he died he was denied a decent burial. Opposition to Copernican astronomy continued for almost two hundred years. It is noteworthy that "in 1822 the Sun received the formal sanction of the Papacy to become the centre of the planetary system."¹ Superstitions about storms and meteors lasted much longer. Man is very slow to relax his grip upon any established mode of thought, especially when it is cemented with prejudice and experiences no commercial or financial competition.

The attack upon the new biology became more severe as the science itself developed. Numerous laymen and clergy opposed the work of Vesalius. The worst weapon they used was the claim that human dissection is un-Christian. More generally, progress in medical science was variously handicapped and retarded for three centuries by persons who said, for example, that illness is divine punishment, that plagues are sent because of sin, that smallpox must be treated by prayer, that inoculation against disease is a violation of God's will, and that mental illness is demoniacal possession. It could be claimed with some justification that such prejudice caused the loss of millions of human lives and untold suffering.

Of course, no thoughtful Christian can afford to deny facts or refuse to recognize any area of discovery and progress. To disregard authenticated facts is dis-

¹ William Cecil Dampier, *A History of Science* (4th ed.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1948), p. 113.

Man and Christ

honest and un-Christian. Condonement of ignorance, prejudice, and stupidity discredits Christian truths and objectives, and it is, therefore, quite likely that academic and religious reactionism did much to cultivate distaste for religion during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and to cause many able minds to turn to philosophical naturalism.

Philosophical naturalism, as stated by extremists in this field, is the theory that all reality is reducible to the substance, or phenomena, and the laws of nature. It assumes that there is nothing supernatural or other worldly. It regards man as no exception, for it assumes that he is only an animated complex of skeleton, nerves, muscles, glands, and other structures. In its radical form, it claims all of his activities are reducible to stimulus and response. A man is, therefore, only an organism, a conscious organism, the highest product of a line of organic development extending back millions of years. According to this theory of naturalism, man is only a thinking animal, subject to the conditions of heredity, growth, training, health, disease, and death experienced by lower animals.

Now, we must accept and respect the realm of nature. We do not argue with a swiftly moving train, leap from a plane, or toy with an atom bomb. Moreover, in nature we seem to find permanence, power, and precision. Then, too, the process of clearing away jungles of myth and superstition seems to expose more of naturalistic reality, from atoms to stars and from amoeba to man. It is likely that it was this scientific

Man and Nature

progress which caused such men as Holbach, La Mettrie, Cabanis, and La Place to turn to a wealth of facts to be found in nature. It offers one explanation why, today, so many people are so fascinated by the natural world and so devoted to it, for the world of nature offers not only opportunity of achievement, it may even hold the secret of reality itself.

A third attitude is assumed by many thoughtful persons. They appreciate the extent and grandeur of the physical universe. They regard with pleasant awe the records of geology. They feel pride and humility when they reflect upon atomic fission. They confess wonder and meekness when they observe organic structures. They believe the universe is divinely created and directed. This group of persons does not, of course, include those sophisticated people who know little about religion and less about science, but presume to adapt religion to science. Some such shallow minds seem to experience a spiritual renaissance when a great scientist states that he believes in God.

When I speak of great and humble men, I mean the great men of science—experimental and philosophical—who with intellectual honesty, comprehensive information, and superior wisdom regard the universe as a manifestation of a supreme and immanent Creator. Copernicus, Bruno, Kepler, Newton, Kant, Charles Darwin, Eddington, Charles Sherrington, du Noüy, Kirtley Mather, Whitehead, and Macneile Dixon are a few members of a group who are scholarly and devout.

Man and Christ

These scholars respect facts, relations, and valid inferences. They eagerly explore, evaluate, and apply. With unfaltering persistence and amazing devices they explore earth and stars, algae and man. With all of their labor and achievement they are humble and reverent. For example, read a good life of Galileo. Examine Darwin's *Descent of Man*. Read Eddington and du Noüy and Charles Sherrington. Catch the enthusiasm and spirit of such men as they describe the structure and development of the human eye, features of the nervous system, or the life of an insect, as they wonder how nervous impulses are translated into consciousness, as they turn the heavy pages of geology, and as they gaze upon the infinitude of celestial orders.

Now, these men know that reasoning based solely upon scientific facts must, of course, restrict itself to observed facts. These facts as such do not prove the existence of God. But these facts are not all; there is the reasoner. The reasoner, by virtue of his inherent capacity, relates, evaluates, and forms judgments. The natural realm of objects, precision, permanence, and time and space then becomes meaningful. The nature of the universe thus seems to require a God of such magnitude as to be the Lord of all the space and of all the time necessary for the creation of the stellar universe and the creation of man. It is thus that the design of objects small and large—atom and star, Euglena and man—becomes evidence of a designer. If such inferences are not sound, then it seems that

Man and Nature

human reason is worse than insanity. If the existence of harmony, beauty, kindness, love, and mercy does not require an author having the power to create them, then it must be that something does come from nothing, that chaos is the father of order, and that elementary logic is a delusion. But we must not overlook this question: If the wise and devout reasoner thus claims the existence of Truth and of truths that exceed the facts of nature and naturalistic phenomena, what are the source and character of his convictions?

Our difficulty therefore persists. What is man's place in the universe? I repeat, science as such does not presume to speak about such matters as the human soul and personal immortality. It does not treat such matters as ethical principles. There are persons who would say that perhaps great scientists indulge in wishful thinking. It is much more likely that the devout and reverent scientist interprets natural phenomena in the light of his deep religious faith and convictions. However that may be, man continues to wonder why an omnipotent and benevolent Creator made a world so helpful and, at the same time, so destructive. Nature often appears to be utterly impersonal and inexorable. As John Stuart Mill so graphically states, nature inflicts, alike upon the guilty and the innocent, disease and torture of body and mind in ways that excel the brutality of the worst of human despots, and it finally brings death to every person. He says:

In sober truth, nearly all the things which men are hanged or imprisoned for doing to one another, are nature's every day

Man and Christ

performances. Killing, the most criminal act recognized by human laws, Nature does once to every being that lives; and in a large proportion of cases, after protracted tortures such as only the greatest monsters whom we read of ever purposely inflicted on their living fellow-creatures. If, by an arbitrary reservation, we refuse to account anything murder but what abridges a certain term supposed to be allotted to human life, nature also does this to all but a small percentage of lives, and does it in all the modes, violent or insidious, in which the worst human beings take the lives of one another. Nature impales men, breaks them as if on the wheel, casts them to be devoured by wild beasts, burns them to death, crushes them with stones like the first Christian martyr, starves them with hunger, freezes them with cold, poisons them by the quick or slow venom of her exhalations, and has hundreds of other hideous deaths in reserve, such as the ingenious cruelty of a Nabis or a Domitian never surpassed. All this, Nature does with the most supercilious disregard both of mercy and of justice, emptying her shafts upon the best and noblest indifferently with the meanest and worst; upon those who are engaged in the highest and worthiest enterprises, and often as the direct consequence of the noblest acts; and it might almost be imagined as a punishment for them. She mows down those on whose existence hangs the well-being of a whole people, perhaps the prospects of the human race for generations to come, with as little compunction as those whose death is a relief to themselves, or a blessing to those under their noxious influence.²

Moreover, nature gives no evidence of personal immortality; death brings permanent silence. Nature raises man up, and then takes him back to herself. Perhaps, like a candle consumed, a man reverts to en-

² John Stuart Mill, *Three Essays on Religion* (New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1923), p. 284.

Man and Nature

ergy, and passes into oblivion. Nature does not answer the age-old cry of the heart of her child, "If a man die, shall he live again?"

As we have observed, nature does not offer a solution for our problem. No Christian, however, can afford to falter in his belief in and search for truth.

MAN AND KNOWLEDGE

THE NATURAL UNIVERSE amazes man. Its size, design, precision, and power arouse awe. Its apparent inclusiveness of all modes of existence frightens a person, for it makes him suspect that he is only a momentarily conscious bundle of atoms. Then he allays his fear by telling himself that he surveys atoms and stars, discovers relations and values, formulates ideas about the universe, and to some extent has dominion over nature. He thus feels that he, and he alone, is unique.

But his exultation is brief. Another crucial problem arises. It is the problem of knowledge. It is the old question about the nature of a person's mind. What is the mind? How does thought originate? How does one's mind develop? What are its limits? What can one know? Can there be, in fact, any metaphysics, or any theology? Can a person know the reality of God, of the human soul, and of spiritual principles? We make assumptions about matters central to our greatest ideas, dearest hopes, highest values, and even to faith itself; and we usually accept them uncritically.

Man and Knowledge

At times we feel that it is a sacrilege to examine them.

The problem of knowledge demands the use of acid tests. For example, the present religious situation requires the most serious and the wisest examination of religious beliefs. We must distinguish between opinion and truth and between credulity and faith. We must appreciate the difference between human devices and divine principles, for, however much we dislike to think so, the dominance of opinion and the impact of pragmatic usefulness are now so great that agnosticism and skepticism about spiritual reality have become prevalent.

Let us examine the problem of knowledge, therefore, from two points of view. First, let us review some concepts of knowledge; and, second, let us note some effects of these concepts.

SOME CONCEPTS OF KNOWLEDGE

There are, of course, numerous concepts of the mind, and therefore, of the nature and limits of thought. This brief survey includes only three present-day doctrines.

First of all, we shall look at a movement that affixed to itself the label of psychology and named itself behaviorism. Behaviorism is the old doctrine of philosophical materialism which has adopted a new name and which feeds itself upon the fruits of biological science. It is a revised version of the ancient doctrines of Democritus, Epicurus, and Lucretius, and an adaptation of the tenets of Cabanis, La Mettrie, Haeckel,

Man and Christ

and other modern authors. In its most radical form behaviorism claims that mind is nothing more than neuromuscular activity. It assumes that consciousness, if it exists at all, is only an impotent epiphenomenon, whereas the human organism and the behavior of the organism are the basic and important matters. The behaviorists say that a person is essentially a very complex, exceedingly sensitive, delicately balanced machine. The machine consists of skeleton, nervous system, muscles, viscera, glands, and other structures, and it functions with fine co-ordination and dexterity. The important thing is the human organism and how it behaves. For mind is nothing more than neuromuscular activity; all learning is the "conditioning" of the organism; thinking is implicit language behavior; memory is the reactivation of neuromuscular patterns; and love is largely thoracic-visceral agitation.

The less radical forms of behaviorism recognize the mind, but they, too, place the major emphasis upon the organism. They regard the organism as the chief object of study and respect. Physiological psychology, paradoxical hybrid that it is, is quite in vogue. It is popular because it is much easier to examine and to teach anatomy and physiology than it is to discover and to teach the nature of states of consciousness and psychological laws. From one point of view, this so-called physiological psychology is definitely materialistic; from another it is a valuable means of studying the relation of mind and body; frequently it is neither fish nor fowl. There are, nevertheless, facts that must

Man and Knowledge

not be ignored.

First, we cannot overlook the relation of the organism to the mind. While nobody has solved the mind-body problem, nobody would deny, at least from the common-sense point of view, the intimate relationship of mind and body. For example, informed persons recognize ways in which the mind depends upon the sense organs, the cerebrum, and other organic structures. Books on anatomy, physiology, neurology, endocrinology, and abnormal psychology are filled with proof of the close connection of mind and body. It is enough for our purpose only to mention brain tumors, hypothyroidism, paresis, hydrocephaly, microcephaly, and encephalitis as organic causes of mental abnormality, and to say that we must safeguard organic health in the interest of mental alertness.

Another conception of knowledge is the empirical. This view of thought is as old as the Sophists of ancient Greece. Although it has appeared many times under various names, empiricism is today the psychological core of pragmatism, instrumentalism, and humanism. Moreover, it varies in its range of emphasis from the working concepts used for the examination of mind to the extreme claims of radical sense perception. For the sake of clarity, empiricism is here defined as the assumption that all of one's knowledge is derived from experience. It is assumed that experience is restricted to sense perception and its derivations. It is claimed that a person inherits only the capacity to learn, and, as John Locke suggests, that at the time of a person's

Man and Christ

birth, the mind is as completely free of experience as an unmarked wax tablet or clean sheet of paper is devoid of impressions. Experience writes upon this clean surface; the mind retains the experiences, combines them, organizes them, revives them, and uses them in such ways as are necessary to produce memory, meanings, values, concepts, and ideas. Minds differ greatly in capacity to receive, to retain, and to use experience, but none possesses any innate information, meanings, or ideas.

As a scientific working basis, the empiricist defines a person's mind as the sum total of his states of consciousness as experienced during his lifetime. It is assumed that his first experiences are sensations resulting from the stimulation of sense organs. For example, he experiences pressure, pain, warmth, cold, tastes, odors, sounds, and colors. These sensations are retained and reappear later, for illustration, as images. Sensation and image may be accompanied by a third type of mental element, affection, which gives the quality of pleasantness or unpleasantness to thought. Complex states of thought consist of combinations of sensations, images, and affection, somewhat as chemical compounds consist of chemical elements. For example, the meaning "book" or the judgment "heavier than" consists of sensations and images, just as nitric acid is a chemical compound consisting of hydrogen, oxygen, and nitrogen. If affection also appears, the meaning or judgment becomes pleasant or unpleasant. A psychological law, called the law of association, ef-

Man and Knowledge

fects the combination of states of consciousness and thus enables a person to form meanings. If it were not for this law, states of consciousness would likely be separate units of experience, and it is probable that no memory, meaning, opinion, concept, or idea would exist.

In view of our problem, it is necessary to review three things about the empirical conception of one's mind. First, there is the unique nature of imagination. The mind unites two or more images to form a new image and, at the same time, retains the images used in producing the new image. One thus uses mental data to form new data, yet retains the data used. The mind is, therefore, somewhat like a builder who would use steel, brick, and lumber in erecting a building, but would keep the materials for another structure. In more or less the same way meanings, concepts, and ideas are developed; and thus it is that the more one uses the data of the mind, the more the mind grows. According to the empiricist, it is this manner of the use and growth of states of consciousness that furnishes us an explanation of the unique creative capacity of one's mind. Nothing like this creative capacity is known to exist in physics or biology.

Another thing of prime importance is the law of association, a law which binds states of consciousness together and later enables them to flow in certain sequences. One thus becomes able to recite the letters of the alphabet, the lines of a poem, or a musical score with ease. Likewise, one can form sequences of ideas

Man and Christ

and repeat freely a lecture or a sermon. The law links image with sensation, image with image, and affection with sensation and image. It makes possible the formation of meanings and the construction of judgments, ideas, and values. The law is also intimately related to neuromuscular-glandular functions, as we can easily see by observing how thought expresses itself through the organs of speech, respiration, heart action, digestion, and locomotion. The law of association is, therefore, a basis of one's habits and attitudes. States of consciousness, whether they are simple or compound, whether they are images or ideas, obey psychological law and, in many respects, govern one's conduct.

Now, in the next place, empiricism offers us a major problem; for a strict empiricism assumes that all knowledge has its origin, directly or indirectly, in sensation. It assumes that there are no innate ideas or any other form of inborn knowledge. For example, sensation is believed to be one's earliest form of consciousness. Image has its origin ultimately in sensation, and it is therefore like sensation in its basic characteristics. Meanings, concepts, and ideas are compounds derived basically from sensation. Affection only colors thought, making it pleasant or unpleasant. Moreover, emotion has nothing unique; it is only a sort of mental-organic zephyr or storm. To what does this lead us? The answer seems to be as inevitable as it is disturbing.

A strict empiricism claims that all a person knows

Man and Knowledge

is derived from his experience, that is, from sense perception. It assumes that, in so far as he thinks, he must think in terms of acquired data of thought. Whether he thinks foolishly or wisely, sanely or insanely, in terms of rote memory or creative reason, he is restricted by acquired data. Evidences of this notion of the origin and growth of thought are numerous, plain, and plausible. For example, a congenitally blind person has, of course, no real notion of colors, for he has never seen colors. A congenitally deaf person cannot think in terms of sound, for he has never heard sounds. It follows, then, that, if a person acquired no sensory data, he could not think. Moreover, we know that a child learns the meaning of speech, printed words, distances, and dangerous objects. We are also certain that he discovers, through experience, that fire burns, that water can destroy, and that certain snakes are poisonous. Furthermore, the pages of abnormal psychology and mental hygiene are filled with illustrations of facts that support the position of the empiricist. I need to mention only such matters as senile dementia, alexia, and total amnesia. It is, of course, proper here to remember that a person learns through direct experience and by instruction from other persons. It must also be understood that there is no such thing as the public mind or the social mind, for the only human mind is the mind of a person.

You readily see, therefore, that there are numerous problems springing from empiricism. For example,

Man and Christ

can sensation ever reveal reality? Do colors, tones, odors, and pressures correspond to physical substance as such? Does sense perception, even when assisted by the finest instruments of precision, reveal life itself? Are combinations of thought, such as ideas or reason, able to expose reality? Where is the reputable physicist who claims to know what matter is? What great biologist dares offer more than a provisional definition of life? What psychologist gives more than a working definition of mind? Now, if the great scientists confess that their observations and inferences are empirically derived and, therefore, that they do not know what physical substance, or life, or mind is, who can prove that soul, immortality, justice, and truth are not derived from sensation and sense perception? Who can know that they are more than creations of the human mind? If the physicist humbly confesses that he has no absolute metaphysics, how can we establish convincingly the objective reality of God, the human soul, and ethical principles? In the face of such problems, the difficulty of our work and the seriousness of our Christian obligation are clear. There are, of course, meanings, values, definitions, logically derived abstractions, and necessities, but is it not possible that a logical inference or an abstraction may be nothing more than refined opinion?

Concepts are acquired, and they vary as widely as do social groups and time and place. Then, what of ultimate reality can be found in them? Heraclitus could have said: "All human beliefs flow." Some peo-

Man and Knowledge

ple would state that Omar was correct in saying:

Myself when young did eagerly frequent
Doctor and Saint, and heard great argument
About it and about: but evermore
Came out by the same door where in I went.

The third point of view of knowledge is the idealistic. I shall use the word *idealistic* somewhat arbitrarily. It here means that the knowing person, using the data of sense perception, can discover the existence of transcendent reality, that he can know of its existence even though he cannot define it or adequately state its nature. It is assumed that a person, by his very nature, possesses capacity to know; that states of consciousness, empirically acquired, are valid evidences within proper limits; that logic conforms to mental law and, properly used, does establish awareness of the existence of transcendent-immanent reality.

We must here caution ourselves against subjectivism. Of course, the mind uses sensations, images, affection, and percepts in forming concepts and ideas. Moreover the lawful nature of the mind is an amazing fact, whether in producing $3 \times 3 = 9$, or a great idea. Such concepts as horse, man, justice, right, and truth are produced. But the concepts themselves are not basic reality; they are abstractions produced by the mind, and in many instances they may themselves be as insubstantial as fairies and Santa Claus. Genuine idealism, however, assumes that abstractions at their best represent the existence of transcendent reality and, perhaps, reveal attributes of reality. Although

Man and Christ

idealism agrees that, in practical matters, the mind is, of course, indispensable, it also claims that the mind is a means of becoming aware of ultimate truth.

But obstacles remain. For example, one hears a great deal about self-evident truths, *a priori* judgments, and intuition. Moreover, to what valid ends can logic reach? Perhaps so-called self-evident truths, *a priori* judgments, and intuition are only swift empirical thinking. Do we not learn that $1 + 1 = 2$, and that a circle is not a square, just as we learn other things? Perhaps logic is valid only within the bounds of the empirical; who, after all, has proved anything for which there is no observable basis? We define the mathematical point and the perfect circle, but do they have objective existence? Perhaps the objects of faith, and even faith itself, are only nice abstractions produced by an empirical mind. But, then again, how can the finite ever be used in satisfactorily proving the infinite?

FRUITS OF THE CONCEPTS

What are some conditions resulting from such theories of knowledge? Behaviorism claims to make an objective study of a person. It says that it would rid us of archaic notions about the mind—foolish beliefs that should follow the soul and other such superstitions into discard. Behaviorism prefers to stress the structure of the organism, the functional unity of all parts of the organism, and the proper maintenance and discipline of the organism from birth to maturity.

Man and Knowledge

It also emphasizes the various conditions of a person's environment. It claims that training, or conditioning, from infancy to maturity, must be such as will result in the most wholesome type of personality. It uses the study of dogs, cats, rats, mice, and other animals under the assumption that such work reveals valuable facts related to human behavior.

For any facts about the human organism and for any valid inferences about human behavior we are, of course, grateful. But we must realize that anatomy and physiology are not consciousness and do not explain awareness, memory, foresight, or meaning. We know that the nervous system cannot evaluate an object, interpret time and space, or even show that $1 + 1 = 2$. We also know that behaviorism is self-contradictory and untenable, for the behaviorist relies upon the mind which he discredits. Nevertheless, the impact of behaviorism persists; and, whether it is a result of behaviorism or not, we feel that man continues to regard himself all too seriously as only an organism. The tangible body, with its wonderful structures, is real, whereas the mind is intangible and elusive; but great physicists and biologists know better than to yield to materialistic behaviorism, and real psychologists resent any discredit of the mind. Nevertheless, a host of people, including in all probability many college students, are influenced by the assumption that physical substance and anatomy and physiology are real and fundamental, but mind is not.

It is my belief that behaviorism is a weak, sterile,

Man and Christ

and unwanted child of biology, paradoxically named psychology, the offspring of a strained effort to have psychology classified as a natural science. In relation to religion, behaviorism discredits the mind, denies the existence of the soul, and reduces man to the status of an animal. I believe that behaviorism is untenable, and I feel that it is a degrading influence upon man and his finest concepts and devotions.

In many respects empiricism is factual, constructive, and progressive. For example, it urges a careful examination of the mind in order to discover its nature and its limits. It questions the competency of a person to think without restriction. Scientific psychology undertakes to describe states of consciousness and formulate laws of mind. It is concerned with such important matters as the growth of a person's mind, the formation of his habits of thought, the basis of his interests, and causes of his conduct. Scientific psychology properly studies the healthy mind and the unhealthy mind, just as the physician studies conditions of health and of illness. Of course, an informed person appreciates the need for the most serious study of the human mind, for he realizes the value of knowing something about good training and poor training, the clean mind and the polluted mind, selfishness, immorality, and criminality. He knows that a person's thought plays a major role in directing his conduct. An informed person applauds the empirical examination of mind, therefore, just as he approves the advancement of medical science. Moreover, psychology

Man and Knowledge

can be of invaluable assistance to religion, for it offers an abundance of facts that can be used constructively in relation to clean thinking and right conduct.

Empiricism is also essential to progress. The stated, or implied, demands of Locke, Hume, James, Dewey, and Schiller that beliefs and dogmas be examined, that meaningless, outmoded, and untenable concepts be discarded, and that we adopt a plan of realistic treatment of human situations, somewhat in the mood of science, are plausible, fruitful, and humanitarian. There is sense in the statement, whether made by Protagoras or Francis Bacon or William James, that man must turn from impotent idols to helpful facts and useful meanings. Reason does not occur in a vacuum. Facts are essential to great ideas, inventions, and developments. Modern science and technology offer convincing evidence that empirical knowledge is indispensable to human progress. Science and technology are only one major example, for progress in any field—law, government, religion itself—depends upon the use of the mind in observing facts, forming meanings, discerning values, and solving problems. In one sense, the mind is an instrument—a superlative one—for exposing a realistic and highly intricate world and for enabling man to find his way through its maze of situations. Our accomplishments prove the worth of empiricism, and the very fact that a person is endowed with capacity to observe, to interpret, to discriminate, and to invent justifies proper reliance upon empiricism.

Man and Christ

But, with all of its merits, empiricism offers no complete solution of the problem of knowledge. For example, it does not offer a satisfactory metaphysics or theology. No science, scientific psychology included, pretends to define a person or to have anything to say about such matters as soul, moral law, and God. The inferences of physics and biology must be derived from experimentation and observation. Likewise, the inferences of scientific psychology must be derived from observable states of consciousness and their lawful nature; and, if he were pressed for a statement, the scientific psychologist would likely agree with Hume that sensation and sense perception never penetrate to reality, not even to the essence of mind itself.

We must realize, furthermore, that empiricism lends itself to dogmatism. This arbitrariness is no more the fault of empiricism than scientism is the fault of science. The plain fact, however, is that some prominent leaders—I do not say, our greatest scholars—claim that empirically derived concepts are our only form of knowledge, that all one can know he learns through sense perception. In view of the achievements of science and technology, they suggest that man himself is competent to work out his salvation and that he must do so. They also say that cherished ideas, such as those of religion, should be discarded. Time permits me to offer only two plain illustrations.

The first is the movement started by Sigmund Freud. Now, I hasten to say that Freud is neither fish nor fowl. He is no part of a scientist; he is not even

Man and Knowledge

a good empiricist; his theory rests upon a preposterous hypothesis. He is no behaviorist, for he does not restrict his claims to the organism. He is no psychologist, for he does not describe states of consciousness, and some of his interpretations of thought are as senseless as they are disgusting. It is not difficult to understand why some people lean upon Freud, but it is a mystery why some religious leaders look upon him as their patron saint, for he calls religion an illusion. Freud says that religious doctrines "are all illusions, they do not admit of proof, and no one can be compelled to consider them as true or to believe in them."³ He refers to religion as "the universal obsessional neurosis of humanity. It, like the child's, originated in the Oedipus complex, the relation to the father."⁴ Freud does not even understand Greek tragedy; it would seem, at least when he wrote *The Future of an Illusion*, that he had never read Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex*. He calls the illusion of religion an opiate, and says that men will suffer when the long-used drug is removed; but, of course, according to his point of view, as stated in the book to which I have referred, man should not become an addict to the illusion of religion.

Freud has many disciples. Some of them are less offensive than he is; others are more repulsive. Some of them realize their relationship to him, while others do not appear to have the remotest notion of the

³ Sigmund Freud, *The Future of an Illusion*, trans. W. D. Robson-Scott (London: The Hogarth Press, 1928). See pp. 55, 57, 76.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 76.

Man and Christ

nature of his doctrine. Obsessions, neuroses, compulsions and complexes, instinctive urges, primitive drives and social inhibitions, hate, love, repulsion, and apathy—all such terms have become popular and are used as lures for the gullible public. The charlatans and the quacks, to say nothing of other addicts of this pseudo psychology are a travesty upon medical science, psychology, and real psychiatry. But another amazing development puzzles a layman. It is the apparent substitution of various modes and implications of this pseudo psychology for religious truth. Read religious and semireligious publications that claim to offer means of relieving insomnia, tensions, and fears. Note the advice about muscular relaxation, regular breathing, music, pillows under one's knees, hot baths, devices of autohypnosis, and other nice aids in psychotherapy. Witness the current emphasis on sex. Are organic relaxation and induced peace of mind substitutes for truth and faith? Does the church possess a great body of knowledge of spiritual reality? If so, why are laymen subjected to so many things that are plainly secular but carry a spiritual label? Many laymen are perplexed. Does a popular novel, a scientific discovery, a social trend, or some psychosomatic practice become an object of religious character, and should it ever appear to be a substitute for the Gospel? Expressions of a thoughtless nature and evidences of disrespectful familiarity with sacred truths puzzle us. In fact, when some of us laymen hear and read cheap and cheapening statements made in the name of re-

Man and Knowledge

ligion, we have mixed feelings that somehow remind us of words which Goethe, in *Faust*, has Mephistophiles utter just after he has talked with the Lord:

"I like, at times, to hear the Ancient's word,
And have a care to be most civil:
It's really kind of such a noble Lord
So humanly to gossip with the Devil!"

The second type of empiricism is respectable and widely influential. It is the type of doctrine made popular by William James, advocated so effectively by John Dewey, and adapted to religion by F. C. S. Schiller. The purpose of the doctrine is to adjust concepts of the mind and of knowledge to the spirit and progress of science and thus to make knowledge progressive and practical. For example, proponents of this doctrine claim that intellectual devotion to such concepts as the absolute, the universal, and the eternal often results in situations that are static and reactionary. They say that reason is not empty speculation but rather that it is experimental intelligence applied to human affairs to enhance human welfare, and they claim that the purpose of reason is the liberation of man from the bondage of the past by resorting to observation and experimentation in the province of practical human needs. A person should use his mind, therefore, to observe changing social conditions and to create new truths and not to speculate about ultimate truth or absolute principles, for, they claim, there are no absolutes, no fixed principles, and no unchanging values. Concepts, ideas, and ideals are only psycho-

Man and Christ

logical productions which arise in view of social problems, which are retained as long as they are useful, and which, when they become obsolete, must be discarded. In regard to ethics, there are no absolute standards, no permanent moral sanctions, and perhaps no divine spirit. God is a synthesis of the best modes of human imagination and abstraction.⁵

If there are no absolutes and no fixed principles, it follows that man is the author of morality and that he formulates moral law at will, retains it as he wishes, and discards it when it pleases him to do so. For example, a moral situation exists only when alternative modes of action present themselves to a rational being. Morality thus enters under the duress of making a choice between alternatives. Man, as a rational being, looks for safety and evaluates possible alternative choices. He therefore formulates a working moral standard, retains it as long as it is useful, discards it when it is out of date. It follows, then, that we must have ethical standards for the same reason that we must have the standard yardstick. There is, of course no absolute yardstick in the nature of things. Moreover, if present moral criteria prove inadequate, let us discard them for more useful standards, just as we may substitute the meterstick for the yardstick. Likewise, the doctrine suggests that we should make humanity the object of devotion in religion and that we should substitute the concept of the State for the idea

⁵ John Dewey, *A Common Faith* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1934); *Reconstruction in Philosophy* (New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1920).

Man and Knowledge

of God.

Now, no sane person can object to the use of the mind in areas of discovery and the promotion of human welfare. It is, therefore, not what empiricism properly achieves that makes it inadequate, but rather what it does not include and, by omission, discredits. It builds magnificent superstructures and disregards sound foundations. It assumes that "man is the measure of all things." It reduces right and wrong, truth and justice to the status of opinion. Honesty is the best policy. Nothing is right except as thinking makes it so. It leaves the impression that the church is only a fine source of personal and social therapy. From such concepts of knowledge developed a Machiavelli, a Hitler, a Stalin. It is easy to see why some of us cannot approve this statement which the late Mr. Chief Justice Vinson made in an opinion: "Nothing is more certain in modern society than the principle that there are no absolutes, that a name, a phrase, a standard has meaning only when associated with the considerations that gave birth to the nomenclature. To those who would paralyze our Government in face of an impending threat by encasing it in a semantic strait-jacket we must reply that all concepts are relative."⁶

Now, carry the doctrine that all knowledge is derived from sense perception to its logical conclusion. It leads directly to agnosticism, and it points to moral anarchy and political tyranny. It makes opinion the

⁶ Eugene Dennis, *et al.* v. United States of America, *Supreme Court of the United States*, No. 336, October term, 1950, p. 14.

Man and Christ

criterion of truth. Since opinion is as variable as time and place, then, what a man *thinks* is right *is right* for him; so there is no enduring principle, no moral absolute, and justice and temperance and honor are right only because thinking makes them so. By the same logic God is good or exists only because thinking makes him so. It becomes plain, then, that the doctrine is a source of skepticism and moral relativism and that it is a seedbed of communistic atheism. If opinion makes a thing right or wrong, every person is his own authority. In a larger way, the state becomes a corporate authority; and, if the state enacts laws making it legal to lie, to steal, to commit rape, to murder, then it is right to do such things. Then, too, if the doctrine is true and fully comprehensive, our theological schools and pulpits can properly substitute materialistic, utilitarian, and humanistic interests and devotions for foundational spiritual verity.

The idealistic concept of knowledge does not escape criticism. A Christian leader must prepare himself to answer by sound argument and by right living serious skepticism and agnosticism about religious knowledge that transcends sense perception and its derivatives. Is reason, at its best, able to exceed its components, or does it only appear to exceed them? Sodium is a metal, and chlorine is a poisonous gas; in combination, they are salt. Hydrogen and oxygen are gases; in combination, they are water. A person's training is long and involved. He usually does not examine the formation, the nature, or the source of his stand-

Man and Knowledge

ards and ideals. He relies upon hearsay, tradition, and accepted authority. He also uses various beliefs and practices as idols and as escapes.

A severe critic of idealism asks penetrating questions. For illustration: How can a person establish as fact his knowledge of ethical principles? How does he know that this is a moral universe? How can he distinguish between faith and reason? What is his evidence of personal immortality? How can he show that prayer is more than personal therapy? One has noble urges, magnificent ideas, great convictions, and unselfish devotions. Are they only the product of psychological experience, or do they arise from a spiritual entity in man that enables him, through the medium of his mind, to become aware of an infinite spiritual reality, God, the human soul, and moral law?

In my opinion, it is our enormous responsibility and our high privilege to discover and to teach the fact that genuine knowledge is a person's awareness of God and God's love for man. However valuable other types of intellectual accomplishment may be, awareness of God and of the imperishable human soul is the keystone of wisdom.

MAN AND CONFLICT

MAN HAS DISCOVERED the tiny place he occupies in the realm of physical space and time. Alongside the physical universe, the human family itself seems trivial. Moreover, he is aware of the dependence of the organic upon the inorganic, and he is unable to find a clear line separating animals from plants. He also knows that he is a member of the order of biological organisms, and he can discover no unique distinction between the human body and that of the brute.

Furthermore, man finds that he is a member of a line of conscious animals. Casual observation, as well as experiment, shows a vast difference in degree, but no clear distinction in kind between the mind of a brute and that of a man. Comparative psychology lists numerous evidences in support of the troublesome claim that man is only the highest type of thinking animal. Moreover, the problem of knowledge is extremely perplexing. Are we only thinking organisms, restricted, as are brutes, to sensory experience and its derivatives? If man is only a thinking animal,

Man and Conflict

and if his needs and interests are limited to organic satisfactions and those psychologically created standards of temporal existence and progress, then perhaps we should say that man is only a hedonistic creature whose material and social progress furnishes him the means of the highest possible satisfaction. But we know that man's achievements in sociology, government, science, technology, or any other such field, however fine, never actually satisfy him. In some respects, the more man thinks and the larger his success, the more serious his problems and the more intense his restlessness become. He thus often becomes tragic in his struggle to resolve his problems.

It is said that the proper study of man is man himself. Let us, therefore, look at man, especially at man in conflict. I call your attention to three things: first, man in conflict with nature; second, man in conflict with man; and, third, man in conflict with himself.

MAN IN CONFLICT WITH NATURE

For ages, man has assumed that he is unique and that, by divine sanction, he exercises dominion over the natural world. He observes physical things, plants and animals, and, as they pass before him, he names them, bridles them, and harnesses them in his service. He has confronted the atom and the microbe, continents and seas, the subterranean reservoirs and the stratosphere, and made them bow to his will.

The road from the primitive cave to the modern home was long and hard. The journey from the no-

Man and Christ

mad's tribe to modern society required serious and constant struggle. Democritus in science, Hippocrates in medicine, Franklin and Galvani in electricity, Pasteur and Jenner and Lister in bacteriology, Madame Curie in radiology, and Hertz in electromagnetics are a few pioneers who blazed one trail. It is trite to mention things so familiar to us, for, of course, man has harnessed streams, captured and used the thunderbolts of Zeus, opened the beds of coal and the lakes of oil deep in the earth, caused mountain range and deep sea to give up their treasure, and made deserts convert their dormant wealth into food and beauty.

Man's accomplishments are now amazing. He causes plants and animals to make rapid growth in structure, quality, beauty, and usefulness. He travels with the speed of the morning; he speaks with the velocity of light; he brings the remotest human affairs to his living room. He has so mastered time and space that his world has become very large, and the world has become very small.

Moreover, at man's orders heavy burdens are lifted from human backs. For example, man has invented the internal combustion engine, the dynamo, and a thousand other machines which relieve him of much hard labor, and he is now harnessing nuclear energy. Man has, also, so successfully sought out causes of diseases and found remedies for so many of them that we must now rely upon Thucydides and other historians for reports about epidemics of typhus, black death, yellow fever, typhoid, and smallpox.

Man and Conflict

Thus, man has revealed his ability, initiative, and constructiveness. He has accepted the command to have dominion, and he can point with pride to his achievements.

But, I remind you, man has dominion only in secondary matters. He controls nothing primary. The seasons still come and go. The sun and moon still rise and set, and the stars somehow manage to exist. Time passes, age advances, bridges must be crossed, tolls must be paid. Whatever man earns, nature eventually collects. The fate of all is death; the final goal of the human family is death. However successful man seems to be in his struggle with nature, nature finally prevails. Seneca knew this when he said: "Whole kingdoms with their kings and peoples with their rulers have met their fate; all men, nay, all things, look toward their last day."⁷ Voltaire was aware of nature's exacting claim when, in agony, he wrote:

I am a puny part of the great whole.
Yes; but all animals condemned to live,
All sentient things, born by the same stern law,
Suffer like me, and like me also die.
The vulture fastens on his timid prey,
And stabs with bloody beak the quivering limbs:
All's well, it seems, for it. But in a while
An eagle tears the vulture into shreds;
The eagle is transfixed by shafts of man;
The man, prone in the dust of battle fields,
Mingling his blood with dying fellow men,
Becomes in turn the food of ravenous birds.

⁷ Seneca, *Moral Essays*, trans. John W. Basore (3 vols.: Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1935), II, 389.

Man and Christ

Thus the whole world in every member groans,
All born for torment and for mutual death.⁸

The grave is silent. Science offers no proof that man in his struggle with nature is, in the ultimate sense, ever the victor.

MAN'S CONFLICT WITH MAN

Every living organism fights for existence. Heraclitus realized the scope of conflict, and said: "War is the father of all things." Charles Darwin, out of his vast store of observations, suggested that progress occurs through the survival of the fittest. Decisive competition between plants occurs in field and forest. Then, too, microbe preys upon microbe, fish upon fish, insect upon insect, bird upon bird, beast upon beast; almost every class of organism attacks other classes. From amoeba to man life threatens life. A system of checks and balances may thus obtain, but a cruel state of claw and fang persists everywhere.

Now, man is no exception. He fights for food, for shelter, for his family, and for his country. In some instances, as in crime and in intemperance, he preys upon his own people. In other cases, on an enormous scale he destroys millions of people in order to enlarge his power and to enhance his reputation. The beast-man of human society—a Domitian, a Hitler, or a Stalin—with mental power and selfish motives far excels the most voracious brute of the jungle in cruelty and slaughter.

⁸ *Selected Works of Voltaire*, translated by Joseph McCabe; with an introduction (London: Watts & Co., 1921), p. 3.

Man and Conflict

Some of us who live somewhat sheltered lives are disposed to overlook grim facts. For example, we often disregard the prevalence of domestic tragedies and major crimes. We often lure ourselves into false optimism and parade claims of wonderful moral advancement. In the field of religion we are especially disposed to employ highly exaggerated, if not spurious, claims of progress. I need to remind you of only one unsavory condition in our paradoxical civilization, for, with all of our humanitarian motives and institutions, the twentieth century is the bloodiest period of human history. In this century two world wars have cost perhaps 100 million lives. A war is in progress. Recent blood purges in eastern Europe and Asia seem to have claimed from 15 to 20 million lives. Then, too, there is the colossal preparation for another war with planes, ships, bacteria, gas, A-bombs, and H-bombs.

Now, it must be pointed out here that various devices have failed to subdue man's predatory and belligerent nature. For example, Horace Mann felt that universal education would greatly reduce crime. In the United States we have placed schools within reach of almost every youth. About 30 million students are enrolled in our elementary and secondary schools, and about 2 million attend colleges and universities. Almost every person in America has access to the screen, the radio, and numerous other agencies of educational influence. But the increase of education and of educational facilities has not reduced crime. One could say that education has actually been a means of devel-

Man and Christ

oping cleverness and of multiplying ways of lawlessness and forms of intemperance. Moreover, I remind you that, in the larger sense, no other people, within the last thousand years, have been as effectively educated in information and techniques as those of modern Germany, France, England, and America. At least from some points of view, it would seem that educational discipline has not reduced conflict, but has increased information, intensified desire, and incited combat.

Again, some people claim that sensuous gratification would guarantee good will and harmony. They seem to believe that if we produce and distribute, and satisfy desire for food, shelter, and other material things, we shall remove the cause of conflict. Science and technology have transformed the modern world, but one would be reluctant to say that physical abundance has brought about a moral Utopia in America or elsewhere. Prosperity did not prevent the First World War. Moreover, more than 50 billion dollars in aid to Europe within recent years has not produced universal good will there, even toward us. Western nations carried science and technology to the Orient and the Near East and awakened there powerful dragons. In reality, science and technology, however wonderful, have crowded people and nations together, given them physical resources, and excited their passions before they developed a sense of superior values, learned to control themselves, or became prepared to live together. The twentieth century offers abundant

Man and Conflict

evidence that physical resources and pragmatic devices alone furnish no complete means of allaying major forms of human antagonism. Political covenants become scraps of paper. Military allies become enemies, as illustrated by the present enmity of Russia and China toward the United States. A plain fact is that economic aid to persons or nations often causes a sense of dependence that becomes translated into jealousy or hatred.

It must also be noted that religion, as variously conceived and adapted, has not removed human strife. Too often a religious organization has become self-centered, has become primarily interested in saving its own life, and has adopted pragmatic devices as a chief means of saving and promoting itself. When a religion becomes thus self-centered, it can be a central motive in human tragedy. Religion has also been used by secular interests in order to support secular motives and even to intensify secular combat. You will recall how Machiavelli advised that, when necessary, religion should be used as a means of unifying the people of the State and thus enhancing the authority and the efficiency of the ruler. You will agree with me that it is not difficult to recognize evidences of the Machiavelian use of religion in such matters as political conventions, holy wars, the declaration of the divine right of kings, and the claim of the infallibility of certain religious authorities. One also recalls such semi-religious slogans as: "Make the world safe for democracy," the "Four Freedoms," and "Christian democ-

Man and Christ

racy against atheistic communism." When a war is in progress, it is, of course, a struggle to victory or to defeat, and all types of evils are employed. Sherman's definition of war is very conservative. But Christians in less tense and tragic days must recognize the ways in which religion becomes prostituted to the level of expediency and opportunism. We must face squarely the fact that whenever and however religion becomes lured into devoting itself to materialistic-pragmatic interests and political agencies, it thus becomes a tool of secular conflict.

We must look beyond the physical clash of man with man if we would find the source of human conflict. Perhaps a major cause exists in the realm of ideas.

A person's mind directs his conduct. The scope and quality of his information, concepts, and ideas determine the nature of his interests and devotions. The conflict of man with man, as in crime and in war, is in a real sense, therefore, a conflict of concepts and ideas. As a high fever is a symptom of a deep-seated infection, the struggle between people is often a symptom of a moral virus. We must, therefore, identify ideologies that produce conflict.

The most effective present-day ideological malignancy is the so-called sensate culture.⁹ This concept of life is all the more dangerous because it is a plausible half-truth which parades itself as indispensable to material progress and as the essence of intellectual ac-

⁹ Pitirim A. Sorokin, *The Crisis of Our Age* (New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1942).

Man and Conflict

accomplishment. A sensate ideology usually promises quick relief, fine results, and rich rewards. It appeals strongly to poverty, dissatisfaction, unrest, ignorance, irresponsibility, insecurity, and fear. It operates with enormous effectiveness when it fastens its grip upon government, education, and religion. For example, in Italy Fascists seized the government and seemed to bring about great agricultural improvement and industrial reforms. German Nazis quickly transformed the German nation from a condition of economic bankruptcy into one of apparent prosperity, political prestige, and military power. Communism has led Russia out of chaos seemingly to such resources and unity as enable her now to threaten to dominate the world. Furthermore, we must not overlook the prevalence and influence of pragmatic motives and devotions such as scientism, types of social security, and the progressive delegation of authority to the government in other countries, including the United States.

Education is a medium in which sensate ideologies can flourish. In informal education the press, the radio, and television shape attitudes, cultivate desires, and establish standards of devotion. In formal education elementary schools and institutions of higher learning are primary agencies in the development of the concepts and the objects of culture. Music and art also reflect and accentuate concepts and ideals. For example, we remember the Nazi discipline of German children, the control of German universities, and the use of Wagnerian music in establishing fanatical de-

Man and Christ

votion to the State. Russia now employs similar devices.

To a significant extent in America the fascinating half-truth of pragmatism now permeates public schools and institutions of higher learning. As Sorokin, Sheen, Hutchins, and Bell so graphically point out, our institutions stress the materialistic and the utilitarian to the extent that ethics, metaphysics, and theology are neglected and thus discredited. A multiplicity of circumstances causes increasing State support and control of our public schools and many of our universities. These secular schools have led, if not forced, private and sectarian schools to modify their standards, practices, and central devotion. The curricula have progressively become devoted to the materialistic, the scientific, and the pragmatic. A result is that a great many teachers and students now feel that the real and the valuable are the observable and the useful. Science uses the telescope, the microscope, the micrometer, and the computing machine; it dissects, analyzes, measures, and formulates laws. Sociology counts, prepares charts and tables, and generally treats human beings not so much as persons but as objects subject to graphs and mathematics. Psychology, even in its better moments, describes states of consciousness and formulates laws of mind. Psychology also devotes itself to such matters as the examination of the organism, measurement of sensory acuteness, detection of galvanic phenomena related to thought, and means of proper discipline of mind and body. Much so-called psychology,

Man and Conflict

however, has become the servant of commercial groups or has let itself become the tool of popular and, often, mercenary fads. While valid educational methods are indispensable and invaluable, it must be understood that they alone have nothing to say about the enduring values and spiritual verities that give unity to the universe and permanent worth to persons. My suggestion to a medical student that he must not become merely a high-class plumber-electrician perhaps should be made to other students. A technician in any field—mechanics, medicine, education, religion—can become so obsessed by details that he does not observe basic values and relations with respect to man, moral law, or God.

Religion has not escaped the impact of modern pragmatic culture. For example, central and enduring truths of our faith include the reality and fatherhood of God, the reality of the human soul, and the sacredness of every person. Without faith in transcendent-immanent spiritual reality, life becomes futile and appears to be reduced to a conscious moment between two nights of oblivion. Religion is, therefore, the most vital of man's interests and needs. Nevertheless, many religious groups now so emphasize size, numbers, organizations, and other necessary but peripheral matters that the heart itself of religion is neglected. The authority of persons, the nature of organizations, material resources, and standards of efficiency often seem to be prior in importance. Moreover, the eagerness and pleasure associated with the

Man and Christ

adoption of some "ism," or fad, or mode of exhibitionism, or escapism make laymen and many clergymen wonder. The frequent substitution of human opinions and practices for the Gospel itself reminds us of what Zarathustra said about the saint in the forest: "Could it be possible! This old saint of the forest hath not yet heard of it, that *God is dead*."¹⁰

In the final analysis, there are two major ideologies, Godliness and Godlessness. A godless culture, whenever and wherever it exists, produces conflict and tragedy. It builds a tower of Babel that eventually leads to confusion and chaos. For when men live and think as animals or when men presume to substitute themselves for God, rather than regard themselves as children of God, struggle is inevitable. Plato states it thus: "Like cattle, with their eyes always looking down and their heads stooping to the earth, . . . they fatten and feed and breed, and, in their excessive love of these delights, they kick and butt at one another with horns and hoofs . . . and they kill one another by reason of their insatiable lust. For they fill themselves with that which is not substantial, and the part of themselves which they fill is also unsubstantial and incontinent."¹¹ How true the great pronouncement, "That man shall not live by bread alone . . .!"

¹⁰ Friedrich Nietzsche, *Thus Spake Zarathustra*, trans. Thomas Common (New York: Random House, n.d.), p. 6.

¹¹ *The Republic*, 586, in *The Dialogues of Plato*, trans. Benjamin Jowett (3rd ed., 5 vols.; New York: Oxford University Press, 1892).

Man and Conflict

MAN'S CONFLICT WITH HIMSELF

In a letter to the Romans, Paul makes this revealing statement: "For the good that I would, I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do." We ourselves do evil when we know better, but can we explain why? How is it that a man is, within himself, so contradictory? His own nature—mind, will, personality, practices—is in such conflict with itself that often a man appears to be a multiple personality. We often quickly and freely place the blame on Adam, heredity, environment, and the Devil, usually because we want a convenient scapegoat. What actually is the seat of inner confusion and turmoil?

Some would say that it is a clash between one's animal nature and his unique human character. For example, instinct often opposes reason. Now, powerful instinctive urges do occur. They are necessary to perpetuate the human race. Also, there is a close relationship between instinct and emotion. Emotion and, in large measure, animal impulses are directly related to the so-called old brain, whereas reason is associated with the new brain, or the cerebral cortex. Perhaps, then, conflict occurs between the old brain and the new brain. At least, when by surgery or by alcohol the centers of reason, whatever they are, become suppressed, animal instincts often become dominant. Also, when emotions become intense, good judgment is likely to vanish.

A person's education is another source of conflict. In this relation it must be understood that one's edu-

Man and Christ

cation begins on the day of his birth, includes all types of experience and all modes of development of his mind, and the relation of his mind to his behavior. It therefore involves all information, meanings, concepts, ideas, ideals, moral standards, loyalties, devotions, and habits. Education even affects the sensitivity of a person's conscience and often selects the objects of his conscience. What a mass and maze of diverse information, opinions, standards, and habits become established in a person! Multiple personality is not restricted to the mentally ill. Observe a person who is gruff and harsh and unkind in business but gentle and refined and benevolent at home. Note a man who is a martinet at home but gracious and courteous in public. Watch a man swerve a car to avoid crushing a dog, and then slaughter our wild-life friends for the sheer pleasure of killing. Observe a neighbor who, in complete kindness, never hesitates to help a person in distress, and then becomes his own worst enemy. Do not overlook the student who wants an education and struggles to avoid learning, the teacher who seeks the truth and lapses into authoritarianism, the administrator who alternately stresses principle and resorts to expediency, or the pastor who in all sincerity proclaims divine love and then adopts opportunistic and selfish devices. We, too, not infrequently see a man who, without a twinge of conscience, feels a deep sense of loyalty, say, to his church but conducts a business that aids in wrecking homes, corrupting minds, and destroying lives.

Man and Conflict

What a jumble of contradictions one's education includes! In some cases, a person's conscience seems to be so fully suppressed that evil schemes and practices never appear to cause discomfort. Occasionally a person achieves saintly serenity, but with most of us conflict does occur. Although I believe there are more good people than bad people, and although I also believe there is good in the worst of men, our training is such that we become drawn so strongly in diverse directions that we often suffer a tug-of-war nervously, mentally, and morally. In its large sense, then, education can be a source of indecision, diverse impulses, fears, neuroses, psychoses, and insanity. In this relation, some forms of religious training must not be ignored. When we consider gruesome and horrifying types of beliefs, we are disposed to say that Lucretius was correct in stating that religion makes men grovel in fear and enslaves them, and, therefore, should be discarded;¹² and we understand how a psychiatrist had some cause for stating that religion is a primary source of mental illness. In view of the fact that experimentalists have produced neurotic cats and dogs by means of conflicting habits, we can understand why certain persons advocate the elimination of all beliefs in moral standards. Such a thesis is, of course, materialistic, animalistic, and sophistic, but it reveals plainly one notion of how unity of personality can be had. Socrates and Plato emphasized wholesome education from the

¹² Lucretius, *De Rerum Natura*, trans. Cyril Bailey (New York: Oxford Press, 1910), pp. 29, 107 f., 135.

Man and Christ

day of a person's birth with serenity as a supreme goal. But for them knowledge leads to serenity only because genuine knowledge is awareness of God and requires loyalty to God.

Let us not assume, however, that the problem of man's subjective conflict is solved. The problem is so difficult that it does not lend itself to naïve treatment. Let us observe two characteristics, from the human point of view, which are at the very center of man's conflict with himself.

First, it is man's struggle to understand the conflict itself. He strives to make himself understand the problem of conflict. He tries to understand pain, tragedy, injustice, and joy, success, justice, and hope. Why is it the good suffer, and the evil prosper? Why is it that man seems to be caught between continuously grinding upper and lower millstones? Is it some power—good or evil—that made those stones, placed man between them, and grinds him throughout life—perhaps forever? Is there any human will, any freedom, any possible escape, any source of divine love and mercy and salvation? The struggle, then, is in the very heart of a person—a struggle to understand; a struggle to know the nature of the conflict and one's own self in its own condition of inner turmoil.

This form of inner conflict is as old as human history. For example, in religious history the *Book of Job*, at length and with profound insight, portrays a man inwardly tortured by his lack of understanding and his desire to understand. Job's problem was not

Man and Conflict

that of loss of property, of family, and of health; his conflict was that age-old plaintive cry of the human heart itself: Why? Why? Why has this happened? Even, Why has God let this happen? In his desperate effort to resolve the conflict between his lack of knowledge and his desire to know, Job was tortured by the suspicion that a battle exists between God and Satan and that man is an object on which they test their strength.

It is also man's struggle to adjust himself as he finds himself in a web of exacting circumstances. Greek philosophy reflects this type of man's inner struggle. The *Apology*, the *Crito*, and the *Phaedo* show us how Socrates faced this problem. With him it involved much more than personal comfort or discomfort, friends or enemies, freedom or execution. It was the will to do the right thing fighting the impulse to do the wrong thing. It was the will to be humble in combat with the urge to be tyrannical. It was the desire to be merciful grappling with the passion for vengeance. Plato states the problem vividly in the allegory of the charioteer who drives two winged horses, one noble and rising upward, the other of ignoble breed and pulling downward. The second characteristic of this inner conflict, therefore, is a person's struggle to make himself live up to the best there is in himself.

Nowhere else in secular literature is this conflict in the soul of man so graphically stated as it is in Greek tragedy. Greek tragedy is tragedy in the mind;

Man and Christ

it is agony of the soul; it is personality on the rack. One who reads Aeschylus' *Prometheus*, *Agamemnon*, and *Eumenides*; Euripides' *Medea*, *Trojan Women*, and *Electra*; and Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex*, finds the human heart laid bare and torn by every diverse major impulse. There, painted with matchless strokes of genius, one finds love pitted against selfishness, reason against passion, freedom against slavery, the spirit of righteousness against the venom of hell. There one finds the uttermost limits of horrors, of perplexity, and of temptation when a person becomes enmeshed in an endless web of circumstances fashioned by man and fate. Suffering is intensified when the victim realizes his own responsibility and his error. When Oedipus let passion overcome reason, he committed deeds so offensive to himself that he tore out his eyes in the utter horror of shame. But no device, not even self-inflicted blindness, resolved his conflict; for, later, Creon said to him:

"Thou art an enemy to thyself, both now
And in time past, when in despite of friends
Thou gavest rein to passion, still thy bane."¹³

In certain cases, the victim adds evil to evil and makes wrong promote wrong, vengeance call for vengeance, and tragedy breed tragedy. When Medea is debating two courses of action—complete vengeance upon Jason or mercy to her children—she chooses the bloody course of full vengeance, but says:

13. Sophocles, *Oedipus at Colonus*, trans. F. Storr (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1909), ll. 853 ff.

Man and Conflict

"Now, now I learn what horrors I intend:
But my passion overmasters my reason;
And this is the cause of direct ill to men.
 ... Why delay
To do these dreadful deeds of evil ... ?
Come, wretched hand of mine, grasp the sword . . .
Do not turn coward! Do not remember that they
 are your babes!
How dear they are to you, how you bore them;
For this short day forget they are your sons,
And thereafter mourn for them. For, although I
 slay them,
Yet they are dear to me, and I—I am a wretched
woman."¹⁴

But in other instances, with grand sublimity, the victim became victor. Socrates met injustice and death in faith and with complete serenity. Prometheus, nailed against a lofty crag where midday fire would scorch his flesh, black night would freeze his limbs with agonizing cold, and no human voice would comfort him, defied anthropomorphic and unjust Zeus. Antigone put her faith in the eternal law of right which is beyond man and death, "unwritten and never failing." Plato makes this magnificent confession: "We ought to fly away from earth to heaven as quickly as we can; and to fly away is to become like God, as far as this is possible; and to become like him, is to become holy, just and wise . . . God is never in any way unrighteous—he is perfect righteousness, and

14. Euripides, *The Medea*, trans. Gilbert Murray (New York: Oxford University Press, 1934), ll. 1077 ff., 1242 ff., 1246 ff.

Man and Christ

he of us who is most righteous is most like him."¹⁵

Conflict persists. At times it seems to become more intense and exacting. Can man solve the problem in terms of his own resources of penetrating mind and stoical courage? I do not think so. We must use our own resources to the uttermost of our ability, but it is my conviction that we must rely upon another source, divine revelation, in order to solve the problem of conflict.

15. *Theaetetus*, 176, in *The Dialogues of Plato*, trans. Benjamin Jowett (3rd ed., 5 vols.; New York: Oxford University Press, 1892).

MAN AND CHRIST

MAN IS EVER RESTLESS. He is never content. Food relieves his hunger, and clothing and shelter protect him. He learns the ways of nature and escapes burdens of fear, pain, and labor. He finds that color satisfies the eye, that sound pleases the ear, and that objects proper to them meet the needs of taste, smell, and touch. But unsleeping curiosity drives him from rest, and so he examines plant and animal, atom and star, and the trackless courses of land, sea, and sky. Discovery does not bring contentment; something impels him on and on. He grasps the reins of nature's laws and guides physical forces, plants, and animals for his comfort and convenience. Still impatient, he searches out the beauty of gardens, music, art, architecture, literature, and friendships. But none of these things, however fine, nor all of them, however many, satisfy his deep-seated and persistent sense of need. Something in a person's very nature cries out for more than material things and human accomplishments.

As strange as it may be, it seems that a person is a

Man and Christ

part of the infinite and that nothing local or temporal can satisfy him who is endowed with the spirit of the universal. He wants to know the nature of himself and the universe of which he is a part. He must try and try to find the what and why of existence. Something urges him to seek perfection in ideals and in work. He also feels that he is an individual; he wants respect and lasting worth as a person; he longs for spiritual, personal immortality. He seeks to know God and to find his place in God's universe and his relation to God's will. He never finds in nature, in mental excellence, or in his struggle in any temporal arena the absolute which he craves. The universal in man craves the ultimate; man is restless until he finds rest in the Eternal.

How can a person know God? How can a man, restless as he is, find the supreme ideal in which he will have full and enduring peace? Many able and devout people have tried to show the way. Ancient sages and modern scholars have tried to find the way. They have climbed to lofty peaks from which horizons have been far-reaching and wonderful. Their reports are wise and helpful, but none is final, none is satisfactory. My conviction is that the restless human mind can find peace and the hungry human soul can find satisfaction only in Jesus Christ who is God's revelation—God's revelation of himself to man.

Jesus Christ is our supreme authority concerning spiritual reality. No other man ever lived or spoke as he did. No other man could say: "I am the way,

Man and Christ

the truth, and the life." No other man could declare: "And I, if I be lifted up . . . will draw all men unto me." A dictator may demand allegiance, but no other man ever gave the unqualified invitation, "Follow thou me." There are saintly people, but none could say: "Before Abraham was, I am"; "The Father and I are one"; "If any man serve me, him will my Father honour."

It is self-evident that I can name only a few traits of him who is the perfect example of truth and righteousness. I shall state only two things that our Lord revealed: They are spiritual reality and standards of righteousness.

SPIRITUAL REALITY

In the first place, our Master revealed spiritual reality. For example, he proclaimed the reality of God. In stating the existence and the sovereignty of God, he did not rely upon an arsenal of scriptural texts or fine devices of logic; he simply and habitually reflected his own divine nature, and he used the confidence and the authority of personal, first-hand experience and knowledge. Jesus had, of course, an amazing store of information and incomparable insight into things, values, and people. But his wisdom went far beyond anything local and temporal. He knew God intimately, communed with him frequently, moved with him closely, and relied upon him constantly. He therefore realized that God is the supreme truth which is basic to every other mode of existence. He was aware that the existence of God explains the origin of

Man and Christ

the universe and gives full assurance of enduring values and valid hope. His divine relationship enabled him to understand how the Eternal God, who "is perfectly true in word and deed, who changes not, and who deceives not by sign or word in dream or waking vision," is the source of unity in the universe, the author of abiding principles, the guarantee of imperishable good, and the basis of love and faith. Our Lord's knowledge of God shows why he never acted in haste, never expressed uncertainty, never violated his mission, and never doubted the ultimate triumph of truth.

Our Master also revealed the spiritual nature of man. He knew that a person—any person—is an immortal soul. He had full respect for the natural world, and he was clearly aware of the importance of health of body, purity of mind, and superior standards of human relationships. But he knew that a person is a priceless, immortal, spiritual entity; and that is why his mission was to persons. That explains the fact that he never met an unimportant person. Whether child or adult, poor or wealthy, ruler or outcast, scholar or illiterate, mentally sound or demoniac, for Jesus everybody was an important somebody, because every person is a living soul. Marcus Aurelius would not let himself become despondent when he suffered the pains of organic illness, for he believed his spiritual nature must remain predominant. Epictetus declared that while his body might bear shackles Epictetus himself must never become enslaved. Seneca felt that the

Man and Christ

Emperor could kill his body, but he declared that no despot would destroy his spirit. But Jesus knew—knew that every person is a priceless soul.

Our Master, furthermore, declared the Fatherhood of God. It is most difficult to understand how God is interested in every person. When we observe, for example, the physical universe with its trillions of stars scattered throughout almost infinite space and timeless time, we utter the age-old cry: "What is man, that thou art mindful of him?" When we look upon nature with her apparently impersonal, cold, precise exactness, in the thought of Omar it seems that a man is only a snowflake falling upon the sea or, in the mood of Voltaire, that man is only a conscious, tormented atom. Then, too, science proves and disproves man's uniqueness with equal facility.

Man himself is a source of confusion and doubt. The enormous number of people, since the time man appeared tens of thousands of years and countless generations ago, startles us. There are now about two billion people in the world, who range from the highest to the lowest levels in mental ability, social standards, and moral quality. They show every type of belief and practice. As history, sociology, and anthropology point out, in their interests, their ideals, and their religious devotions they vary about as much as time and place permit. They are backward, and progressive; they love, and they hate; they defend each other, and they slaughter each other; some are saintly, and some are worse than beasts of the jungle.

Man and Christ

But Jesus knew that God loves every person. He said that God loves every one of his children as the Good Shepherd cares for each member of his flock. He declared that God's love is deep and abiding, long-ing and welcoming, and forgiving and blessing, like the love of the father of the Prodigal Son. Our Lord himself spent his life in a ministry of perfect love, and he made the supreme sacrifice in proof of divine love. Our Lord's love was no abstraction, nor was it for humanity in general. It was for individual persons—for a blind man, an afflicted youth, an outcast woman, a troubled centurion, a fisherman, a scholar, a widow whose only son was dead. It was a genuine, persistent, magnetic love that held and transformed any person who responded to it, whether it was a Mary Magdalene, a Zacchaeus, or a Saul of Tarsus. Christ's words, and his life, and death are God's revelation of his love for every one of us.

Our Lord also revealed moral law. He knew that the laws of the Living God are no fiction of the human imagination. He was aware that every human situation rests ultimately upon spiritual reality and is, therefore, a moral condition. Call God's laws what you will—justice, temperance, right, beauty, love—Jesus knew that this is a God-centered universe, that spiritual principles do prevail, and that man is morally responsible. He knew that God is not mocked and that God's laws cannot be violated with impunity. That is why he cried out: "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and his righteousness." He showed the enduring

Man and Christ

nature of moral law when he declared that, although heaven and earth will pass away, not the least part of moral law will ever cease to exist. He also knew that the sanctions of moral law are inescapable. That is why he spoke so plainly about secret thoughts, attitudes, motives, and ambitions; that is also why he placed the stamp of divine approval upon sincerity, honesty, kindness, gratitude, humility, and love.

These truths—the reality of God, the human soul, the Fatherhood of God, and moral law—are not new, neither are they old. They are timeless; they are dateless; they are placeless. It is upon these truths that human dignity, hope, and faith must rest. They are the bedrock foundations upon which freedom-loving people must live and build the institutions of free people. It is to these truths which God revealed in Jesus Christ that a Christian must commit himself freely and without apology. They are the Truth which our Master said enables us to become free.

STANDARDS OF RIGHTEOUSNESS

In the second place, our Master applied spiritual reality to life. Jesus was no idle theorist; he was not content with mere belief in truth. He made it plain that spiritual truth is the most practical thing in the world. His application of divine truth to human life reveals the ideal standards which are the landmarks of righteousness. I name four of them.

First, our Lord set the standard of wisdom. Jesus grew in wisdom. Every window of his alert mind was

Man and Christ

wide open. He knew seasons, storms, floods, and sunsets. He was familiar with soil, seed, planting, and harvesting. He knew trees, flowers, and fruits; and he spoke freely of birds, dogs, sheep, and cattle. He understood the yoke, foundations of buildings, political situations, and religious organizations. He knew the Scriptures and quoted them freely.

Jesus also saw life realistically. He knew wealth and poverty, health and illness, freedom and slavery, wisdom and foolishness, humility and arrogance. He saw homes illuminated by love, darkened with tragedy, and saddened by death. He met the blind, the diseased, and the socially outcast. He observed devout worship and sheer hypocrisy. He listened to words of gratitude and loyalty, and he heard fickle praise, clever treachery, taunting mockery, and bitter condemnation. He knew self-righteous religious leaders and political despots. He talked with a scholar on a housetop, noticed a despondent man by a pool, saw people afflicted by disease, watched children at play, saw people having divided loyalties, listened to the selfishly ambitious, was acquainted with the tyrant and the exhibitionist, found a demoniac who lived with the dead, and looked upon a sinner weeping at his feet.

Some people have vast information but possess few ideas. It was not so with Jesus. He spoke of stone and sand, mustard seed and grains of wheat, a candle and a coin, lilies and birds and gave them divine meaning. He used a widow's small gift to reveal God's

Man and Christ

standard of judgment and a child's cry for bread to show God's love and care. He spoke of the wind in telling a respectable scholar that he was spiritually blind. He made a cup of water a way of revealing to a Samaritan woman that he was the Messiah and a means of teaching her that God is a spirit who must be worshiped in spirit and in truth.

In his wisdom our Master never tried to dazzle his audience with words, with a mass of information, subtle argument, or artificial illustrations. With perfect taste he fitted the garment of language to the body of the idea. Who is conscious of language or thinks of style when he reads the words Jesus uttered? Who can detect in his ministry to the ill, the confused, and the sinful any trace of artificiality or arrogance? With divine insight he never made an error in his diagnosis of a problem or in the remedy he prescribed. Nothing ever dulled his sense of values or his appreciation of spiritual truth. For example, a rich man was interested in personal comfort and security; Jesus was concerned about the man's soul. Gadarenes were worried about swine; Jesus devoted himself to an afflicted man. Religious leaders stressed public display; Jesus was genuinely humble. A group of men wanted to trick Jesus about killing a woman; Jesus made the men convict themselves, and forgave the woman. Pharisees were fanatically devoted to Jewish law; Jesus declared that the Living Truth is superior to any legal code. When Mary of Bethany broke the alabaster box of ointment and men complained about waste,

Man and Christ

Jesus placed the stamp of divine approval upon gratitude and graciousness and beauty.

Our Lord's wisdom is also revealed in his mission. At the outset of his ministry he reviewed three great fields of opportunity for leadership and achievement. But he realized that material needs, political interests, and organized religion, however valuable, are less important than spiritual truth established in human hearts. With supreme wisdom he therefore committed himself unreservedly to the revelation of God to human souls, and he never violated his mission by word or deed. He never mistook the temporal for the permanent or the local for the universal. He never substituted the artificial for the genuine, an opinion for an idea, or expediency for principle. He was genuinely kind, unselfish, and careful. He was habitually sympathetic, just, merciful, and helpful. He never overlooked a person in need; he never denied a good request; he never neglected an unknown person in order to help a distinguished citizen; he never caused a person to believe that he was worthless or to develop a feeling of inferiority. His patience and love were boundless. His disciples often refused to learn, but his patience with them was excelled only by his loyalty to them and his love for them. When the murderous crowd milled about him on the cross, with amazing devotion he said: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." Priests wagged their silly heads, mocked him, and said: "He saved others; himself he cannot save." "If thou be the Son of God,

Man and Christ

come down from the cross." But our Lord refused to compromise his divinity or violate his mission by using a spectacular method or by saving himself from pain and death.

Jesus also set the standard of moral courage. He knew that the way he chose was difficult and dangerous. He saw that he would meet prejudice, ignorance, hate, injustice, and untimely death. But his commission was from God, and he therefore never ignored a responsibility, evaded a vital issue, or violated a principle. He chose the hard way of life. As a result he had no home. His neighbors tried to kill him. His family misunderstood him and felt that he was mentally ill. Pharisees insulted him and made plans to destroy him. Crowds followed him and then left him. Fickle public opinion applauded him and then clamored for his death. One of his disciples betrayed him; three of them slept during his agony in Gethsemane; one of them profanely denied knowing him; and all but one of them deserted him in the hour of danger. But he was so firmly resolved to teach the truth about God and man that he never faltered or turned from the way that led from Nazareth to Calvary.

Epictetus said that when a man enters the room and you tend to become afraid, you should remember that God is also present. Jesus knew that God was with him; so he never acted with doubt, never failed to speak the truth in love, and never expressed fear. He endured slanderous tongues and heard insulting

Man and Christ

mockery. Bigotry supported by ignorance and vested interests finally killed him, but he died so courageously that a Roman officer who helped crucify him said: "Truly this man was the Son of God."

Our Master also set the standard of wise and positive ministry to human need. He knew that spiritual reality, wisdom, and moral courage belong in no ivory tower. They exist in a realistic world; they point directly to human need; they require means of relief; they demand action.

In his ministry to human need Jesus did two things. He removed burdens from bodies and minds. For example, he gave sight to the blind, made the untouchable leper clean, and healed a Samaritan woman's child. He cured an epileptic youth, healed a man afflicted with palsy, and made a demoniac well again. Like a great physician he never hesitated to give relief to any person who asked for help.

As he ministered to people, Jesus also cultivated a person's self-respect. He therefore required confidence, initiative, loyalty, and intelligence. He told a blind man to go wash in the pool of Siloam. He asked the man with the withered hand to stretch forth his hand. He told lepers to go and show themselves to the priests. He ordered the whimpering man by the pool to pick up his bed and walk. Again and again he said: Seek, knock, ask. In his effort to develop self-reliance Jesus, furthermore, required full and firm loyalty. In plain words, he said: "Let the dead bury their dead." "No man can serve two masters."

Man and Christ

"No man, having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the Kingdom of God." In stressing the need of good judgment, he spoke of the tragedy caused by the blind leading the blind, showed the utter silliness of casting the pearls of one's life to swine, and described the dismal despair of foolish people who neglect resources and close doors of opportunity forever. He affirmed the high ideal to which a man must give complete devotion by making clear the fine sense of values of the merchant who found the pearl of great price and then sold all he had in order to buy the best.

Our Master, then, set up no cheap, weakening, easy standard of ministry. He left no place for moral opiates, quick panaceas, or devices of quackery. His divine imperative was that every person must become his best and do his best. It demands work and care, and it never approves ignorance and carelessness. It commends beauty and perfection, and it never condones ugliness and mediocrity. Our Lord never approved low and easy standards, and he never respected limp minds and lazy bones. His ideal requires the profoundest devotion, the wisest effort, and the finest achievement of which a person is capable; for a person is created in the image of God, and his ministry is the ministry to human souls in the name of the Eternal God. That is one reason why our Lord said: "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father in heaven is perfect."

Our Master, furthermore, revealed the nature of

Man and Christ

faith. I hasten to say that I cannot properly define faith. I do know, however, that we must not substitute credulity for faith, because unguarded readiness to believe or easy acceptance of some object of thought can lead to numerous pitfalls including some of those listed as symptoms of mental illness. Nor must we assume that mere probability, reasonable certainty, logical probability, or any other empirically derived condition of assurance is faith. We know how easy it is to accept an idea that conforms to our wishes, beliefs, and pleasure. We know how inclined we are to wishful thinking and how disposed we are to adopt a belief that promises a reward of some sort. It is easy for us to understand that so-called faith in business transactions, mathematical computations, the efficiency of means of transportation, and the daily rise of the sun comes from our experience with tangible objects and situations. To say that faith consists of such rational certainty reduces the origin of faith to sense perception and leads straight to such sophistry as the claim that truth is only opinion, that religion is a product of fear, and that God is a logical necessity springing out of wishful thinking.

How can a person know spiritual reality? For example, how can one know that the soul is immortal? How can a man know that he is a soul? How can one know that there is a God? How can a person know the reality of moral law and therefore know that there are the enduring principles of right, justice, temperance, love? How can one know that there is a divine plan

Man and Christ

for his life to which his life must conform? No man has ever seen God, a soul, immortality, or an ethical principle. Such forms of reality do not come within the realm of sense perception or any other form of rational observation, nor can any empirical field prove their existence. I do not understand that history, logic, and science either prove or disprove them, nor is it clear to me that any human device, however fine, can establish their existence.

Man, nevertheless, yearns for God and for immortality. With all of his imperfections and with varied forms of belief, something infinite in a person's nature makes him dissatisfied with the temporal, rebel at the thought of oblivion, long for the infinite, and hope for immortality. There is, then, the conviction of the existence of spiritual reality. There is, therefore, an ineffable longing of the human heart for the Eternal. There are those people who, through faith, have such firm conviction of the reality of God, the human soul, and spiritual principles, that, to the best of their knowledge and ability, they will not violate those truths. Such persons do what they believe is right and honest and just and good, not for any hope of reward but because of utter respect for the truth itself. That is why Plato's righteous man would not yield to the promise of temporal power and fame, although he was misunderstood, tortured, had his eyes burnt out, and was killed. That is the reason Job cried out: "Though he slay me, yet will I trust in him." Such is the lesson of the story of the old woman

Man and Christ

who said, when she was asked why she carried a pan of live coals in one hand and a jug of water in the other: "I am going to burn heaven and quench the fires of hell, so people will love the Lord for his own self."

Faith, then, is the positive conviction of the existence of unseen reality. It is the substance of active good will. It is the means of releasing unique divine power as righteousness. It is the will to do one's best in honest and honorable work and to leave one's destiny in the hands of God.

Jesus Christ is the revelation of perfect faith. He knew spiritual truth so well that he always acted as if he was fully aware of the presence of God, the nature of the immortal soul, and the requirements of divine law. His life was the perfect harmony of truth and righteousness. When our Lord was on the cross where evil attacked the good, failure seemed to triumph over success, hate enshrouded love, despair obscured hope, and death enveloped life, our Master knew that all of the forces of evil cannot triumph over imperishable good. So, he committed his spirit and his destiny to the hands of God.

What is man's relation to Christ? In *King Lear*, Kent says to the King: "You have that in your countenance which I would fain call master." In Jesus Christ man can find every fine thing that he needs, the ideal that he would become, the destiny for which his soul longs. In Jesus Christ man finds him whom he would fain call master, and his heart cries out:

Man and Christ

"Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God." It is in him that we find the perfect faith that guarantees the validity of our faith. Jesus Christ is the Living Truth which no formula of man and no tomb of death can hold. He it is who would walk with us when we are so despondent that all seems hopeless, just as he joined the men on the road to Emmaus and caused their hearts to burn within them. He is the Divine Magnet who, when we recognize him, will make us rush to him, as Simon Peter did when he saw his Master on the shore. He is the Living Christ who would transform us, as he changed Saul of Tarsus when Saul met him on the road to Damascus.

It is my conviction that in Jesus Christ, and in him alone, can man find the way from strife to peace and good will, the truth that gives freedom, the Eternal Spirit in which his restless soul finds rest.

As lovely Beatrice led Dante along the upper terraces of Paradise and found "a beauty which was gladness," the poet exclaimed: "A light there is up yonder which maketh the Creator visible unto the creature, who in beholding him hath its own peace; and it so far outstretcheth circle-wise that its circumference would be too loose a girdle for the sun." In Jesus Christ man finds truth so large that it is too loose a girdle for the universe.

REFERENCES

- Aeschylus. *Agamemnon*. Translated by Gilbert Murray. New York: Oxford University Press, 1939.
- Aeschylus. *Prometheus Bound*. Translated by Gilbert Murray. New York: Oxford University Press, 1931.
- Bell, Bernard Iddings. *Crisis in Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1949.
- Butler, J. Donald. *Four Philosophies*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1951.
- Buttrick, George Arthur. *Prayer*. Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1942.
- Carson, Rachel L. *The Sea Around Us*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1951.
- Dampier, Sir William Cecil. *A History of Science*. Fourth Edition. Cambridge: The University Press, 1948.
- Dante Alighieri. *The Divine Comedy*. Carlyle-Wicksteed translation. New York: Random House, 1932.
- Dewey, John. *A Common Faith*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1934.

References

- Dewey, John. *Reconstruction in Philosophy*. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1920.
- Dixon, W. Macneile. *The Human Situation*. London: Edward Arnold & Co., 1937.
- Eddington, A. S. *The Nature of the Physical World*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1929.
- Euripides. *The Electra*. Translated by Gilbert Murray. New York: Oxford University Press. N.d.
- Euripides. *The Medea*. Translated by Gilbert Murray. New York: Oxford University Press, 1934.
- Euripides. *The Trojan Women*. Translated by Gilbert Murray. New York: Oxford University Press, 1915.
- Freud, Sigmund. *The Future of an Illusion*. Translated by W. D. Robson-Scott. London: Hogarth Press, 1928.
- Galileo. *The Private Life of*. London: Macmillan Co., 1870.
- Goethe, Johann Wolfgang, von. *Faust*. Translated by Bayard Taylor. New York: Random House, 1912.
- Greene, Theodore M. and others. *Liberal Education Re-examined*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1943.
- Huntington, Ellsworth. *Mainsprings of Civilization*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1945.
- Hutchins, Robert Maynard. *The Higher Learning in America*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936.
- Hutchins, Robert Maynard. *No Friendly Voice*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936.

References

- James, William. *The Varieties of Religious Experience*. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1902.
- Jeans, Sir James. *The Mysterious Universe*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1933.
- Jones, Rufus M. *A Call to What Is Vital*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1949.
- Jones, Rufus M. *The Testimony of the Soul*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1936.
- Lucretius. *De Rerum Natura*. Translated by Cyril Bailey. New York: The Oxford Press, 1910.
- Lundholm, Helge. *God's Failure or Man's Folly*. Cambridge, Mass.: Sci-Art Publishers, 1949.
- Mill, John Stuart. *Three Essays on Religion*. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1923.
- Morgan, John J. B. *The Psychology of Abnormal People*. Second Edition. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1936.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Thus Spake Zarathustra*. Translated by Thomas Common. New York: Macmillan Co., 1930.
- Noüy, Lecomte du. *Human Destiny*. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1947.
- Payne-Gaposchkin, Cecilia. *Stars in the Making*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1952.
- Plato. *The Dialogues of Plato*. Translated by Benjamin Jowett. Third Edition. Five Volumes. New York: Oxford University Press, 1931.
- Rosanoff, Aaron J. *Manual of Psychiatry*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1927.

References

- Salter, Andrew. *The Case Against Psychoanalysis*. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1952.
- Schubert, Charles, and Dunbar, Carl O. *A Textbook of Geology*. Third Edition. Two Volumes. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1933.
- Schweitzer, Albert. *Out of My Life and Thought*. Translated by C. T. Campion. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1933.
- Seneca. *Moral Essays*. Three Volumes. Translated by John W. Basore. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1935.
- Sheen, Fulton J. *Philosophies at War*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1943.
- Sherrington, Sir Charles. *Man on His Nature*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1941.
- Sophocles. *Oedipus at Colonus*. Translated by F. Storr. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1909.
- Sophocles. *Oedipus King of Thebes*. Translated by Gilbert Murray. New York: Oxford University Press, 1911.
- Sophocles. *The Antigone*. Translated by Gilbert Murray. New York: Oxford University Press, 1941.
- Sorokin, Pitirim A. *The Crisis of Our Age*. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1942.
- Sperry, Willard L. *Reality in Worship*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1939.
- Stetson, Harlan True. *Man and the Stars*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1930.
- Supreme Court of the United States. No. 336. Octo-

References

- ber Term, 1950. *Eugene Dennis, et al. v. United States of America*.
- Titus, Harold H. *Living Issues in Philosophy*. Second Edition. Cincinnati: American Book Co., 1953.
- Voltaire, François Marie Arouet de. *Selected Works of Voltaire*. Translated by Joseph McCabe; with an introduction. London: Watts & Co., 1921.
- White, Andrew D. *A History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom*. Two Volumes. London: Macmillan Co., 1896.

"... a manifesto in Christian philosophy by a man of genuine maturity. I am struck by the lucidity and brilliance of style. I am also impressed by the work as a statement of the Christian standpoint as it is challenged from many standpoints in the contemporary scientific, political and philosophic world view of secularism. The last chapter does constitute a Christian answer to the perplexity of modern man. It is a fertile and penetrating interpretation and appreciation of the person and message of Christ... a magnificent statement. ..."

—ROBERT E. CUSHMAN

*Professor of Systematic Theology in the
Duke University Divinity School*

"A direct and positive message about ageless absolute and fixed principles, to which any civilization must be anchored, if it is to endure... a transcendent expression of Christian truth... grand in thought and style. Let neither clergyman nor layman be without this book."

—ROBERT LEE HUMBER, JR.

*Prominent Attorney in Greenville,
N. C., and former Vice-President of
United World Federalists*

"Through these pages a Christian philosopher speaks a 'true and lively' word to Christian ministers, and his affirmation of faith in the reality of God, the spiritual nature of man, and the validity of moral principles will be interesting and helpful to every thoughtful layman who reads the book."

—O. T. BINKLEY

*Professor of Christian Sociology and
Ethics, Southeastern Baptist Theological
Seminary*

Duke University Libraries



D02045329P

Duke University Libraries



D02045329P